

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

LAST month we called attention to the first volume of the *History of Israel*, which carried the story down to the Fall of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., and was written by Professor T. H. Robinson. We now have pleasure in directing attention to the no less important second volume (Milford; 15s. net), which is written by Professor W. O. E. OESTERLEY, and deals with the period from the Fall of Jerusalem to the Bar-Kokhba Revolt in A.D. 135. It thus embraces the Exile, the Persian, Greek, Maccabean, and Roman periods, and ends at a point over two and a half centuries beyond any data furnished by the Old Testament. The nature of the writer's previous studies has enabled him to handle the intractable material of the post-Exilic period with the same competence as Dr. Robinson has treated the pre-Exilic period.

Of the later period we use the word 'intractable' advisedly, for the literary and historical problems which arise on that field are, if possible, even more intricate and provoking than those which gather round the pre-Exilic period. Except for the later centuries, the evidence is lamentably meagre, obscure, confused, perplexing, sometimes even contradictory, and much of it bears the very manifest stamp of bias; and the new and welcome material which became accessible with the discovery of the Elephantine papyri has raised, as such discoveries almost always do, a fresh series of problems. It is fortunate that the presentation of this period should be in the hands of such a scholar as Dr.

OESTERLEY, who, besides an intimate acquaintance with the sources and the vast literature that has gathered round them, has a real *flair* for historical reality and a fine discriminating judgment, which, while declining to be dogmatic where dogmatism would be an impertinence, yet threads its way through the labyrinth and issues in a more than plausible reconstruction of the facts.

The chief difficulty with which the modern historian has to deal, apart from the paucity of the data, is the drastic redaction to which the compiler of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, has subjected his sources. One of the merits of Dr. OESTERLEY's *History* is that he has made this very plain, and he has not minced matters in his statement of the facts. Dealing with Ezr 1-6 he roundly says that while the Chronicler, in compiling the history contained in these chapters, utilized some valuable documents, 'he has mixed up his material, he has confused names, and he has altered various details in order to bring them into conformity with his preconceived ideas,' with the result that the history contained in these chapters 'cannot be regarded as reliable,' and 'it is impossible to get from the text as it stands any clear idea of the course of events.'

In this case the particular interest that vitiates the Chronicler's presentation of the history is his desire to prove that the rebuilding of the Temple was undertaken by the exiles as soon as, or very soon

after, they returned. In such a matter the evidence of Haggai and Zechariah, who were contemporaries—and who, by the way, Dr. OESTERLEY believes were both ‘sons of the Exile and came from Babylonia’—is infinitely to be preferred. These prophets he also believes to have been the last supporters of the monarchical idea: their opponents, who defended the theocratic idea, eventually won the day; and he thinks we may explain the disappearance of the Kingship ‘without supposing that outside interference brought this about.’ It is far from improbable, however, as Sellin pointed out long ago in his ‘Zerubbabel,’ that the passionate hopes which were gathering round this ‘Messianic’ figure may have roused the suspicions of the Persians, and have drawn down their vengeance, especially if those hopes had expressed themselves in the form of a rebellion. In any case Zerubbabel disappears from the scene: if he was executed, that would be well calculated to crush the monarchical idea beyond hope of resuscitation.

The most conspicuous illustration of the Chronicler’s attitude to historical sequences is his putting of Ezra before Nehemiah. Whatever may have been his motive—possibly to give the priest precedence over the layman—it has thrown the narrative into inextricable confusion, creating improbabilities which Dr. OESTERLEY has well shown we may unhesitatingly regard as impossibilities; and we are glad to note that he says emphatically, ‘there is now no room for doubt that Ezra was Nehemiah’s successor,’ but we are equally glad to note that he refuses to believe that Ezra is simply a creation of the Chronicler’s imagination.

The most radical illustration, however, of the ‘animus’ of the Chronicler is his anti-Samaritan bias, and the discussion of the relations subsisting between the Samaritans and the Jews is one of the most valuable sections of the *History*. Dr. OESTERLEY points out that the difference, which was rooted in the distant past of Judah and Israel, was not racial or religious, but purely political: it was not till about the year 445 that actual hostility between the Samaritans and Jews began, and the initial act which tended in course

of time to bring about a schism was due to the action of Nehemiah in driving out one of the grandsons of the high priest because he had married the daughter of Sanballat.

Thus the real breach between the two took place seventy years after the rebuilding of the Temple, and, despite Ezra’s circumstantial story, Dr. OESTERLEY insists that there is no evidence that the Samaritans interfered with the rebuilding. ‘The whole idea is a fiction of the Chronicler’s.’ The antagonism between the two did not arise in that connexion. Later experience has been projected back into the earlier period. ‘It is perfectly clear that in Ezr 4¹⁻⁵ the Chronicler has made the conditions of the time of Nehemiah apply to the time of Zerubbabel; and what happened later at the time of the building of the walls is reproduced at the time of the building of the Temple.’

There are other interesting suggestions, if not all new, at any rate urged with fresh point. One is that Ezekiel’s relatively friendly attitude to Samaria and his hope of a reunion between the northern and southern kingdoms may be explained by the fact that the prophet may in exile have had ‘opportunities of coming into contact with some of those northern Israelites who had been deported and settled down in districts of what had once been part of the Assyrian empire.’ They may well have been settled in or near the very districts to which the vanquished Jews in 597 and 586 had been deported.

Another important suggestion is thrown out by Dr. OESTERLEY in his valuable discussion of the Elephantine papyri. The curious and rather baffling fact that the language of the papyri is Aramaic—baffling on the assumption that the colonists were Palestinian Jews—he explains thus: ‘We suggest that the original colonists in Elephantine did not come from Palestine, and were not brought into Egypt by Psammetichus, but that they were Israelites from Assyria and belonged to the second generation of the Israelite captives who were deported after the fall of Samaria. . . . Those in the Mesopotamian provinces were in the midst

of Aramaic-speaking people, and would soon have become familiar with Aramaic which they would have adopted in place of Hebrew.' Some of these Aramaic-speaking Israelites may have joined the Assyrian armies which invaded Egypt and established garrisons there. If this explanation be correct, it still remains strange, as Dr. OESTERLEY frankly admits, that the colonists never use the name of Israel in reference to themselves.

Yet one more suggestion. What was 'the book of the law of Moses' that Ezra read at the great public gathering in the broad place before the water-gate? Various opinions have been held. It is extremely improbable that it was the whole Pentateuch. The Priestly Code, or part of it, or the Law of Holiness—all these have also been suggested. Dr. OESTERLEY's suggestion is that 'what was read consisted of extracts from the Pentateuch, in the form which it had assumed by this time, and that these extracts were portions which were generally applicable to all the people, and that these portions were among those which had been added during the Exile; they required explanation because, although the subjects dealt with were in themselves familiar to the people, the new meaning attaching to them was not familiar to them.' And the subjects included—whatever else—Circumcision, Sabbath observance, and the keeping of the Feasts.

These are but a few specimens of the stimulating quality of this admirable *History*, and they are all drawn from the earlier period. The historical intricacies of the later period are unravelled with a sure hand. There is the same mastery of the material, the same power to put familiar things in a fresh light. As here, for example, in discussing the Maccabean revolt: 'when it is asked who took the first step in the attempt to eradicate Judaism, who they were who slaughtered the Jews when they came up to the sanctuary to worship, who laid waste the sanctuary and abrogated the feasts and sabbaths, and brought contempt upon the holy place—the answer is, not the Syrians; but the Jewish Hellenistic party, the "transgressors of the law." And this is Jewish testimony.' And again:

'Whatever faults the Pharisees may have developed it is but bare justice to record that had it not been for them the Jewish religion, with the eternal truths it taught, would have disappeared.'

This volume, as lucid as it is learned, will still further enhance the reputation of Dr. OESTERLEY as one of our foremost authorities on Judaism; and the two volumes together constitute a *History of Israel* which is abreast of the latest investigation and discovery, and does honour to the Biblical scholarship of this country.

The New Morality, as expounded by Bertrand Russell and Aldous Huxley, exalts sexual freedom above the institution of the family. It urges that nothing should be allowed to interfere with the freedom of sex-life. If the ideals of family-life stand in the way of this freedom, the family—noble and beautiful institution as it may be—must be mended or ended. And the opinion appears to prevail with the New Moralists that the tradition of the family will sooner or later come to an end, the State taking over the obligations of parenthood.

The Rev. G. E. NEWSOM, M.A., Master of Selwyn College, Cambridge, has written a timely Essay entitled *The New Morality* (Nicholson & Watson; 6s. net). We wish that the material had been better arranged, and in particular that repetitions had been avoided; but the formal defects of the Essay do not prevent us from observing that it contains much good and forceful writing, and that, taken as a whole, it justifies the publishers' claim for it as 'a vigorous challenge to the modern revolutionary views on Sex and the Family.' Preachers and social workers who would exalt the high morality of the Family above the New Morality will find useful material to their hand in these pages.

Mr. NEWSOM has many an indictment to make in the course of his pages against the tenets of the New Morality. We shall not record them all, but are content to single out the following. He accuses the New Morality of depreciating the goodness of

life by a doctrine of primitive man which belittles what is fine in our inheritance from the animals ; by a theory of the family which explains its origin as a barbarism and its decay as a moral liberation ; by an ethic of sex which discards the element of permanent devotion ; by an estimate of motherhood which is surely untrue to the psychology of woman ; and by a vision of the future State as coming under an aimless tyranny of science.

But perhaps the strongest and most useful chapters in the book are the last two, in which Mr. NEWSOM sounds the note of good hope. One of the most hopeful signs of our modern social life is in his view the increase in cultural associations among neighbours. He instances a comparatively new movement, the National Society of Women's Institutes, which held its first annual meeting recently in the Albert Hall, where, from 5000 centres in the country, representatives of some 300,000 members were assembled, full of their social and cultural enthusiasms. This one assembly of people stood for 300,000 homes ; and it is on friendship between families, it is contended, that good neighbourhood normally depends.

'We are watching the growing-points of our civilisation when we see an enrichment of neighbourhood pour its refreshing stream into the life of the family, and when we see the family, thus refreshed, developing its essential gifts to purify and warm all the forces of neighbourhood. . . . Any one who has had the privilege of sharing in the normal life of the English people is inclined to sink through the floor with shame when he glances at the morbid sex literature which represents our life of home and neighbourhood as heading away from all this upspringing culture and running downhill to the morass.'

Far from portending the destruction of the family the modern emancipation of women will make for the improvement of the ethical quality of family life. The old impulses and relationships—parental, connubial, fraternal, filial—will remain in all their variety, but the old element of hardness will be melted by the infusion of a finer spirit of com-

radeship. 'Even quite stupid men have lost their terror at the sight of an educated woman, and the more intelligent men rejoice in the resources of married comradeship that are opened up by the education of women.'

A notable feature of our time is the extraordinary degree of public interest which has been stirred in regard to the problems and findings of physical science. Even the man in the street vaguely apprehends that revolutionary changes have taken place in scientific thought, and there is widespread curiosity to know what bearing these may have upon the ultimate questions of philosophy and theology.

In a very wise and able little book, *Stars, Atoms, and God*, by the Rev. HARRIS ELLIOTT KIRK, D.D. (Hodder & Stoughton ; 3s. 6d. net), this matter is competently dealt with. The writer does not attempt to elucidate the findings of the astronomer and the physicist, though he shows himself to be abreast of the latest knowledge in these fields. What he does is to indicate the positions which have now been reached, and may be held to be provisionally established, and then to consider what these positions imply and how far they may be held to point towards and encourage a spiritual view of the universe. While clearly perceiving and expressly stating that physical science can never discover God or offer direct proof of the reality and value of the spiritual world, he shows how a point has been reached in physical discovery where it becomes almost inevitable to postulate a spiritual background.

The witness of the stars is at first disconcerting. In their immeasurable age and magnitude they dwarf man to utter insignificance. For ages man was able courageously to return the stare of the stars while he conceived this earth the centre of the universe and the stars as intimately bound up with his personal destiny. But now he is compelled to think of himself as 'an atom clinging to a grain of sand,' a physically insignificant item in the vast

sum of things. He has been quite beaten out of his sense of self-importance, and his faith in immortality, his fond hope that he had a secure and permanent place in the universe, has seemed an idle dream.

Certain recent findings of science, however, would appear to call in question this disparagement of man and of his earthly home, and to suggest that other than quantitative measures must be taken into account. The first of these relates to the unique character of the solar system. It is now generally accepted that the earth and the other planets had their birth in a mighty star-collision, that such a collision must be reckoned an inconceivably rare and perhaps unique event, and accordingly it may well be that in all the wide universe this earth of ours is the only spot capable of sustaining life as we know it. 'If this be true, then the earth regains the status that it lost when the Copernican system was introduced.' Another of the recent findings of physical science is that space, though unbounded, is finite. It is pictured as something after the nature of the surface of a sphere which, though without boundaries, returns upon itself and is of measurable dimensions. This means that the physical universe, however immense, is measurable, and may come to be surveyed and measured in all its length and breadth by the mind of man; which inevitably suggests the thought that the universe cannot be the whole of reality, but is a manifestation of the comprehending mind. A third significant finding of recent science is that the universe is made of perishable stuff. The old idea that matter is eternal and indestructible is quite given up. Matter is found to be of the nature of energy which at some point of time must have been set in motion. 'If we want a concrete picture of such a creation,' says Sir James Jeans, 'we may think of the finger of God agitating the ether.' And this energy with which the physical universe is endowed is running to waste and will inevitably end in a dead level of uniformity when all physical life and motion will have ceased. 'These positions raise questions concerning the meaning and purpose of such a structure, but astronomy cannot answer them. The fact that our small earth is the home of

personal mind has an important bearing on final meanings. The more thoroughly the universe in the large is explored, the more impressive becomes the sense of mystery at the heart of it. . . . If mind should turn out to be the only permanent substance in the universe, and if the only way we can know it is in the form of personal consciousness, then the idea of immortality lies at the heart of it.'

Turning from stars to atoms to see whether in the study of the infinitely small we may solve the riddle of the universe, we find that here also physical science has passed through a period of revolutionary change. The concepts of substantiality and constancy, which once held undisputed sway, have now been given up. Matter, as represented ultimately by the atom, was conceived as most substantial, something hard, tangible, and indestructible. Now it has been resolved into protons and electrons revolving in their orbits, and these again are found to be not real entities but merely symbols through which we endeavour to picture the mysterious working of some wholly inscrutable power. Allied to the idea of the substantiality of matter was the idea of the constancy of Nature. All was rigidly determined and therefore predictable. In such a world there was no room for freedom or indeterminate change. But now this mechanical view of the universe has been completely undermined. Researches in connexion with the Quantum Theory have brought to light a principle of indeterminacy at the heart of things. The action of the ultimate units is not predictable, and there is a mysterious discontinuity in their revolutions. Physical science can only speak of these phenomena in general terms and deal as it were in averages. It is no longer in a position to give support to philosophic determinism, and there is no longer any physical argument against free will.

Physical science has thus broken through the material envelope into an immaterial world which can only be imperfectly expressed in symbols. It has been made to see and confess that in handling the purely physical it has not come into touch with the ultimate reality or discovered the hidden meaning of the universe. Physical science has been

brought to a point where it is in urgent need of a background to render this mysterious universe intelligible and rational. 'It would appear as though nature were saying to us: "Do not take me for granted. I am not at all what I seem. Do not imagine you have reached the heart of my mystery when you get down to the electron. There is something beyond the electron. . . . I have more important things to say to you. For instance, look at yourself. You are a part of me. In fact, did you but know it, you are my interpreter. . . . There in your own mind, in the rich content of your consciousness, is a golden string; wind it into a ball, and it will lead you into the heaven of my mystery, and enable you to understand what it all means." Such is the word of nature, and it is beginning to be the word of science too.'

Physical science, then, having failed to come into touch with ultimate reality, but on the contrary having found that reality is ultraphysical, leaves the field free for the suggestion that 'if there be such a thing as ultimate reality in the universe, it must be something like ourselves: a Creative Mind, in which all things subsist. . . . This, of course, has long been familiar ground for philosophers, but this is the first time when profound reasons for the conception have come from the mature and trustworthy positions of pure science. *This is the new thing* in the present situation, and we ought not lightly to dismiss it as merely speculative.' As Sir James JEANS has said, 'To-day there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading toward a non-mechanical reality; the universe begins to look more like a great thought than like a great machine.' It is admittedly neither the function, nor is it in the power of science to give us a satisfactory conception of God. But 'just as the revival of interest in classical learning formed the leaven in the dough of scholasticism and produced the renaissance of the fifteenth century, so may these scientific positions act as yeast in twentieth-century thought and develop a movement towards a spiritual philosophy more in accord with present trends.'

As Huxley coined the word 'Agnostic' that he might have a religious label among his brother scientists, so Pope Pius x. coined the word 'Modernist' that he might have a designation that would cover all those who denied doctrines that he regarded as essential to the Faith, but desired to remain within the Catholic fold; or rather, he did not coin the word, but he gave it a new meaning.

Pope Pius x. had power to introduce a new term into theological controversy: he had no power to ensure that the term would always retain the sense he gave it. If we are to discuss Modernism with profit, we must come to some agreement as to what the word means.

This is one of the aims of *Modernism, Past and Present*, by Herbert Leslie STEWART, M.A., Ph.D., Professor of Philosophy, Dalhousie University, with a foreword by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Ripon (Murray; 12s. net).

The book is really a history of toleration in matters of Christian belief. Dr. STEWART has an acute sense of the essential, and a wonderful capacity for sustaining the interest of the reader throughout the long and complicated story. He will be a learned reader, indeed, who does not find new and vivid light flung on some 'worthy' or some controversy of the past or the present from the pages of this fascinating volume.

Our Lord declined to accept ancient dogma, ancient customs, ancient ceremonies, simply on the ground that they were hallowed by long usage and the benediction of the Jewish Church. Does that refusal make Him a Modernist? Dr. STEWART says 'Yes.' The traditionalist would say 'No'; since the mind of Christ is the norm of right thinking in the Christian Church.

When the early Hellenists saw that the new wine of Christianity could not be confined within the wine-skins of Judaism and began to preach to non-Jews, were they Modernists? Again the traditionalist would say 'No.' Modernism is in some sense a rebellion. Philip in Samaria may have been

departing from established usage, but he was in rebellion neither against his Master nor against any ecclesiastical authority.

Luther led a revolt, largely successful, against the ecclesiastical authorities of his day. Was he then a Modernist? Dr. STEWART denies the title to him and to most of the Reformers, not because of 'their ghastly doctrine of God's capricious injustice, their spirit of relentless persecution, their mania for consigning papists, heretics and witches to a common and early grave'; but because they 'proclaimed as emphatically as any cardinal of the old church that individual choice of belief was sinful, and that on peril of eternal shipwreck each soul must accept "the revealed truth."'

Erasmus declined to take part in Luther's revolt against the Church authorities; yet Dr. STEWART calls him 'the typical Modernist.' Erasmus shared the indignation of Luther at the moral abuses that had crept into Church practice; but he thought he had found a more excellent way of dealing with them. Luther would forcibly separate the good wheat from the tares: Erasmus believed in the method of the leaven. Luther came out: Erasmus stayed in.

Dr. STEWART then seems to follow Pope Pius x. in confining the term Modernists to men who, while departing in important respects from the received traditions of the Church, advocate their reforms from within the Church, not from without. Is there much scientific basis for this limitation of the scope of the term? Erasmus pleaded for studied courtesy rather than virulent abuse, for a patient work of healing rather than the surgeon's knife.

Dr. STEWART acknowledges that, in the circumstances of their day, it was the Luther method, not the Erasmus method, that was needed. In our own day men like Alfred Loisy and George Tyrrell have tried the Erasmus method within the Roman Church, with conspicuous want of success. The Roman Church has lived 'by the machinery of supernaturalism.' 'As crowd psychologists the Roman leaders have been unrivalled, and they made

no mistake about the power of sacerdotal magic.' Yet Dr. STEWART believes that in the Protestant Church the place of the Christian Modernist is within the Church. This raises a question of great interest.

As generally understood, the Modernist controversy has reference chiefly to the attitude to be adopted to the results of scientific investigation and of the critical study of the Bible during the past few generations. Why should a clergyman hesitate to accept the new knowledge? The answer is that, since the days of Augustine, the acceptance of the orthodox creed was an essential of salvation, and the new discoveries in physical and Biblical science seemed to conflict with the old creeds.

What, then, was the duty of a clergyman who had signed the old creed but accepted the new knowledge? John Morley had no hesitation in answering the question. He had nothing but withering contempt for the man who had 'secured a livelihood on condition of going through life masked and gagged,' who was compelled to 'recite the symbols of ancient faith and lift up his voice in the echoes of old hopes with the blighting thought in his soul that the faith is a lie and the hope no more than the folly of the crowd.'

Lord Morley was known to his contemporaries as 'honest John,' a designation which was not always applied in admiration. He was a great, and no doubt a convinced, Liberal. When he was appointed Secretary of State for India the hopes of India's politicians ran high. Yet all that Lord Morley gave India was the Morley-Minto Reforms: a step forward indeed, but a step that left India a very long way from self-government. Faced with a concrete situation, 'honest John' did what the rest of us do. The honest Liberal, finding himself in a place where Liberal doctrines did not seem to apply, abandoned neither his creed nor his post; nor do we regard him as a hypocrite for the compromise he made.

But is it quite certain that a Modernist clergyman can no longer recite the historic creeds? Human

language is very elastic ; and one objection to creeds as a safeguard of the faith is the difficulty of framing a form of words that is susceptible only of the interpretation the framer put upon it. People reciting the same creed, all with equal conscientiousness, may differ widely in their theological outlook.

A clergyman who has no sympathy with ancient doctrines of inspiration may nevertheless believe whole-heartedly that the word of God is ' contained in ' the Scriptures, and is the only infallible guide to faith and conduct. The question whether we believe that Jesus is the Son of God is often taken as the decisive test of orthodoxy. Do we mean by this : Son of God in a physical sense, with special reference to the Virgin Birth ? Are we thinking chiefly of the moral union of Jesus' will with God's will ? Or are our thoughts in the intangible realm of metaphysics ? Or do we understand the phrase on the analogy of a well-known Hebrew idiom : Son of Man, son of a prophet, son of Belial ?

On the face of it, the statement that Jesus was born of the Virgin Mary seems free from ambiguity. But it is at least an arguable proposition that it involves two statements : that Jesus was born of a human mother to a real bodily existence, and that His mother was a virgin called Mary. Is one who believes that the former of these propositions was originally the more important to be debarred from reciting the article because he has doubts about the second proposition ?

Only one who is ignorant of Greek can imagine that there is no ambiguity in the statement : ' I believe in the resurrection of the body.' It has been maintained that the conception underlying the word *sōma* would be more adequately expressed by our word ' personality ' than by our word ' body,' and that the Apostle Paul was as incapable as Huxley of saying that he believed in the resurrection of the ' flesh.'

Granted that there are articles in the creeds and items of traditional belief that a Modernist cannot accept in any form, is there to be a fresh schism

every time there is a new discovery that seems to conflict with received doctrine ? In the circumstances of our day, have not our Erasmuses a better right to be heard than our Luthers ? Dr. STEWART says that Robertson Smith was dismissed from his Chair in Aberdeen for the views he had expressed about the date and authorship of certain Old Testament books. Would it not be about as near the truth to say that he was dismissed from his Chair because there was more of Luther than of Erasmus in his methods of controversy ?

If, at the instigation of John Morley, all clergymen who accepted the new knowledge had resigned in a body, the spectacle no doubt would have been an imposing and edifying one. But would their sacrifice have served the cause of truth ? Is it not certain that such a course would have given the public a completely wrong impression of the vulnerability of the Christian Faith, would have led men in general to believe that the structure had collapsed when all that had happened was that part of the scaffolding had been torn away, and so would have served the interests of blighting falsehood rather than of truth ?

Moreover, if only conservatives are left to shape the counsels of the Church, then the Church can never restate its faith to meet changing conditions, a task which the Church of Scotland, for example, has faced more or less boldly more than once.

At times Dr. STEWART almost gives the impression that he thinks the Church can dispense with a formal creed. The Modernist, as he conceives him, is indifferent to the truth or falsity of physical miracles, is very tolerant of different views on Incarnation and Resurrection, and is not anxious about the extent or the manner of the inspiration of Scripture.

But Dr. STEWART is equally clear that a man has no right to call himself a Modernist unless he retains the essence of the Faith. And so we come back to creeds again ; for the answer to the question, ' What is the essence of the Faith ? ' must be a statement which is in some sense a creed.

The members of a living Church will always want to know what are the things most surely believed among them. A living Church will always try to satisfy this need. May it be that the fault lies in the use to which we put the creed? Dr. Denney

said we should rather 'sing' the creed than 'sign' it. He meant the same as Bishop Gore meant when he urged people to regard the Athanasian Creed, not so much as a 'creed,' but rather as a 'cantic.'

The Fellowship of Reconciliation.

BY PERCY W. BARTLETT, LONDON.

WE are all pacifists now. We have not agreed yet on the precise extent to which, and manner in which, we are against war; but at least we are substantially united as Christians in an earnest desire and endeavour to make the indispensable Christian contribution to the real peace of the world. We agree that for the construction of positive relations of mutual respect and helpfulness between people and nations, which are of the essence of justice, something opposite to the spirit of war, something characteristically Christian is required. Forbearance and patience are wanted rather than insistence on rights. Sympathy, understanding, interpretation, reconciliation, and even the attitude that we call redemptive, to all of which war is an enemy, must, as we have learned from bitter experience since Versailles, enter into national policies if further tragedy is to be avoided.

Looking backward, we can only regard with tenderness our hostilities and failures in the past, and especially the extremes of feeling about Christian duty engendered within the Church when war struck us in 1914. Sorrowfully we confess that when the great demand of 1914 came upon us it found not only politics and diplomacy bankrupt, but religion also. Some few had spent energy, physical and spiritual, in the older peace work, only to be jeered at by the crowd when their pebbles were of small avail to dam the flood; but most of us had foreseen little of the inevitable results of a commerce, a finance, a colonial policy, a diplomacy in Europe, an armament expenditure all over the world impossible to square with Christian principles. We had not clearly thought of our faith as one that must express itself also in the sphere of economics and politics and in international relationships, or else be mocked; the State, business, and religion were unrelated conceptions. In general we had

neither contemplated the dilemma for the Christian of an acceptance or a refusal of the State's call to arms, nor seen the vision of the healing of the nations; and when the storm broke there was no time for the long process of thinking afresh from first principles right up to the action of the moment. The crowd declared emphatically against the hesitancy of thought and discussion at such a time; 'Let everything be thrown into the job of winning the war; and let all talk about principles be postponed until afterwards.' The Church could not withstand the rush of events and emotions. The best she could do was to settle down to the duty of administering her consolations and encouragements to living and to dying. Broadly speaking, she had nothing markedly Christian to say that was immediately relevant to the larger issues. Such a lover of peace as Dean Moore Ede argued that the Church could not separate herself from the nation and that Christians must accept the consequences of agreements made by Governments. Public school traditions of defending the country, standing up to the bully, keeping faith and rescuing the weak, and general ideas about doing a man's job, saving civilization and waging a war to end war found general acceptance without further discussion and became the working creed of the country. Beside such apparently practical and manly principles, any talk about the higher law of Christendom, about peacemaking and forgiveness seemed hopelessly and maddeningly feeble and futile; it seemed to ignore the supreme demands of defence and justice. In such an atmosphere scarcely any felt that they could confidently present the message of the gospel as something more than a repudiation of the paganism, brutality, and utter wrongness of the war method, as indeed an assurance of a way out, through fearlessness, understanding, and love.

None at all could see how to express the essentials of the Christian spirit in vigorous, stirring, and dramatic action equal to the need of the moment. That was the persistent challenge of those days; but the Christian was practically beaten by the question, 'What else could we do?' He could not, in a few deft strokes, show how to overcome evil with good. So the soldier took control.

But in spite of the overwhelming difficulty, confusion, and tragedy of it all, small groups felt that, risking the charge of fiddling while Rome was burning, they must face the fundamental contradiction of war and Christianity, and give themselves to the labour of thought and prayer and to the search for the distinctively Christian way. Was Christianity only a relative truth to be set aside as inapplicable when the greatest issues had to be faced? Could it be that Jesus Christ was insufficient when it came to a question of world catastrophe? Was a Christian shut up to the alternative of either doing nothing or else engaging in the general slaughter, if only to the extent of patching up the wounded to hurl them back into the fighting line? What could the Christian duty of peacemaking mean in terms of practical action at such a time? If it was impossible to imagine Jesus using a bayonet, what did the Cross really mean when the life and death of the world seemed to be in the balance?

The Society of Friends at once gave a partial answer to the challenge of war by truly healing action, appointing within a few days of the outbreak a committee for the assistance of distressed enemy aliens, stranded and friendless here. It was a happy thing to learn later that this piece of Samaritan work had been paralleled in Germany. The Society of Friends was further able, with American and other help, to organize large scale relief of war victims of all nationalities abroad, beginning with those in the devastated areas of France and Belgium, and going later to the help of the famine sufferers of the blockade in Austria and Germany, to the typhus ravaged districts of Poland, and to the millions who suffered from the drought on the Volga. But besides doing practical things, it also recalled us to thought on first Christian principles by issuing, on the 7th of August 1914, its Appeal to Men of Goodwill, by renewing its unqualified testimony against all war, and by initiating an investigation of the roots of war in the economic system. Other Christians turned also to conference and discussion of the ethical questions involved in war, and a shower of literature resulted. A series of pamphlets called 'Papers for War Time' may

be remembered, published by a mixed group. Some felt that it was not going deep enough into fundamentals, and that a more essentially Christian statement must be made. It was then that the Fellowship of Reconciliation had its real beginning. Talks began in college rooms. Certain of those who had been present at the Quaker conference held at Llandudno in September 1914, including a few members of other Churches, called a new conference of about a hundred and thirty men and women of various denominations. They met at Trinity Hall, Cambridge,¹ in the last days of 1914, and felt as a result of the quiet discussions there that they must stand together and unite in search into, and practice of, the deeper meaning of Christianity. They did not attempt to tie each other down to words, but they based their further work on the conviction 'that love, as revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ, involves more than we have yet seen, that it is the only power by which evil can be overcome and the only sufficient basis of human society.'² They desired to accept the principle of love fully and 'to take the risks involved in doing so in a world which does not as yet accept it.' Love definitely forbade them to wage war, but called them 'to a life service for its enthronement in personal, social, commercial, and national life'; and they dared to offer themselves to God 'for His redemptive purpose, to be used of Him in whatsoever way He may reveal to us.' They sought 'one spirit, the Spirit of Christ, reconciling man to God and man to man.' They wished 'to state positively and constructively the message of reconciliation,' and to bear the ministry of reconciliation which they felt had been in a special sense laid upon them. Sloppy and sentimental and even dangerous though the word might seem to others, they did not shrink from regarding love as basal, thinking of it always as that divine and vital outgoing of the soul to men 'revealed and interpreted in the life and death of Jesus Christ.' Adopted as a principle, it was seen to be quite revolutionary and to involve the reconstruction of the individual way of life and of the shape and meaning of society. War and all hostility were necessarily excluded. A new kind of relationship, man to man and group to group, differently motivated and differently expressed, had to be contemplated. There must

¹ The papers read at Cambridge by Henry T. Hodgkin, Maude Royden, Carl Heath, W. E. Orchard, and others were collected and issued in the book *Christ and Peace*.

² See *The Fellowship of Reconciliation* (Foundation Statement, 1914).

be something in it definitely reflecting the gracious and redemptive attitude of God towards man. It must be of the essence of peace. With all this in mind, the original group 'felt the need of uniting in a spiritual fellowship with those in all lands who hold that as followers of Christ they are committed to this endeavour after a way of life inspired throughout by love.' They wished to express their conviction in a spirit of humility and to guard against controversy, recognizing that they were but a few among the many sincerely seeking to do the will of God. They took the name 'The Fellowship of Reconciliation,' bearing in mind, but not pretending to any monopoly in, Paul's words to the Corinthians,¹ and not less the warning in the Sermon on the Mount, 'First be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.'²

A membership was enrolled from an office set up in the home of Miss Lucy Gardner, the first secretary (afterwards the secretary of C.O.P.E.C.), and later moved to 17 Red Lion Square, London, where the Rev. Richard Roberts, now in Toronto, the Rev. Leyton Richards, now at Carr's Lane, Birmingham, and the Rev. Oliver Dryer, now at Lasswade, near Edinburgh, served successively as secretaries. The membership quickly rose to a maximum in England of some eight thousand.³ Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin, the first chairman, visited the United States in 1915, and was followed by the Rev. Leyton Richards; both of them found a welcome there; and the American Fellowship, born at a conference held in November 1915, was organized in 1916, with Bishop Paul Jones and the Rev. J. Nevin Sayre on the secretariat. Contact with Dr. F. Siegmund Schultze and other friends in Germany could not be renewed until after the War. But in 1917 the news came of the foundation of a Christian peace society in Sweden on the lines of that founded in Copenhagen by Holger Larsen in 1913. A Dutch 'Brotherhood in Christ' was founded in 1916 at Bilthoven. And the Peace Programme of the White Cross, a Catholic movement in Austria, was published. All these bodies were soon to come together. In September 1917 the *Venturer*, one of the organs of the Fellowship, quoted from the magazine of the Danish Peace Society, the document signed by Archbishop Söderblom and other neutral Christian leaders appealing for a righteous and speedy peace, and offering to act as intermediaries in restoring communications between Christians in belligerent countries. This was the document to which the Pope sent a response.⁴ The

editor commented: 'It is an encouraging fact that the article immediately following this statement of the Neutral Church Leaders in the Danish magazine, is a translation in full of the message of the Society of Friends to men and women of every nation who seek to follow Christ. Such expressions from the different nations are the beginning of the "Christian International."'

In October 1919, as Miss Lilian Stevenson has recorded in her little book, fifty men and women from ten countries, including Dr. Siegmund Schultze from Germany and M. Leon Revoyre from France, met at Bilthoven in conference, and the issue of their meeting was the definite formation of the movement towards a Christian International, later called the International Fellowship of Reconciliation. Campaigning was at once begun. Fellowships were quickly formed in Germany and France. In January 1921 an international group spoke in more than a dozen of the principal towns of Germany, breaking down all barriers and destroying the meaning of the words 'enemy' and 'foreigner.'

From the first there was a strong desire to express the message in practical form. For some months, in the winter of 1920-21, an international unit, drawn from six nationalities—Swiss, Hungarian, British, Dutch, Austrian, and German—carried on reconstruction work in the devastated area at Esnes, near Verdun. 'At that time France was perhaps the most difficult field for the planting of international ideals.' 'Esnes was the precursor of the Movement for Voluntary Civilian Service, led by Pierre Cérésolle, which in 1928 enrolled 632 men and 78 women from all parts of Europe in the service of their fellows in distress in Lichtenstein.'⁵ Heavy work in reconstruction had been done similarly in various parts of Switzerland from 1924 onwards. M. Pierre Ceresole has continued that service, with the help of the Fellowship, and in 1930 took a large international party to clear flood-devastated land near Montauban in the south of France, and in 1931 and this year parties to help Welsh students and unemployed miners in a scheme for improving Brynmawr in South Wales and Rhos, near Wrexham. Everywhere the 'moral' of this international service has at once been understood. Not less practical has been the work of interpreting enemy countries to each other through conferences and visits. In 1922 French journalists were taken round Germany and introduced to representative groups in a number of centres. Reconciliation

¹ 2 Co 5¹⁸.

² Mt 5²⁴.

³ Now over 3000.

⁴ *Venturer*, January 1919.

⁵ *Towards a Christian International*, by Lilian Stevenson (I.F.O.R.; 1s.).

tours of various kinds have been undertaken by members of the Fellowship of one nationality or another until scarcely a country in Europe, not excluding Italy, the Balkans, and Russia remains unvisited. Catholic members have repeatedly toured Poland, speaking there about peace with Germany, and further plans are being matured for service along that difficult frontier. A small group in Czecho-Slovakia has laboured to interpret Czech and German to each other, through the exchange of children—over 2000 in a year—for holiday periods. This year (1932) some 50,000 people were addressed in France and Germany by a travelling group of F.o.R. young people. Miss Edith Ellis and Mr. George M. Ll. Davies were both able to get closely into touch with famous Irish leaders while they were still 'on the run,' and to do something to bring the two countries a little closer together in the months before the treaty. It was significant that quite recently a religious weekly published the suggestion that Mr. George Davies should now go again, a suggestion that has not been entirely ignored or without results.

One wishes, too, that Dr. Henry T. Hodgkin were still in China. He formed five groups of the Fellowship there between 1920 and 1921, under the name of the 'Love Only Group.' He was instrumental in bringing Japanese and Chinese together in conference in those very difficult years, and some of the same people have been in correspondence in recent months, maintaining a link of good feeling across the gulf created by events in Manchuria and Shanghai. Mr. Horace Alexander went to India in 1930 and helped to pave the way for the Irwin-Gandhi Pact. Two other members of the Fellowship went to India last winter on a reconciliation tour, one of the results of which was the publication in *The Times*, over the signature of the Archbishop of York, of the appeal by Dr. Rabindranath Tagore for a gesture of goodwill and for the rebuilding 'upon the bare foundation of faith' of a relationship of peace between the peoples of India and England.¹ Another was the letter from Mr. Gandhi himself, received here in June this year and similarly published, expressing his keen desire for peace.

The Swedish Fellowship carried out an interesting piece of interracial reconciliation in one of the most difficult areas of the world by establishing a colony of Armenian refugees on the Lebanon, gaining the goodwill of the Arab Emir and his people. The American Fellowship has, through Mr. Howard Kester, tried to bridge the gap between negro and

white man in the south of the United States, promoting there a series of interracial conferences and trying to deal with the problem of lynching. Mr. John Nevin Sayre was one of a small group that rode over rough country to get an appeal to General Sandino when Nicaragua was in rebellion against the presence of United States Marines. Mr. Charles Thomson for three years represented in Latin America 'the Fellowship's intervention of friendship aimed to displace intervention by the Marines.' He promoted the first Carribbean Conference, held in Costa Rica, to consider all the 'conflict problems' in the Central American states and the canal areas. The American Fellowship was behind the movement in the American Churches that cut down the large cruiser programme and paved the way for the Kellogg Pact. It has throughout maintained an able and vigorous propaganda in the press, through the post, and in co-operation with other organizations for personal pacifism, disarmament, the outlawry of war, the demilitarization of education and the promotion of interracial goodwill.

The British Fellowship has throughout maintained a continuous peace witness through pamphlets, through the public press, and through the Fellowship's own periodicals,² to the constructive application of the spirit of reconciliation to all our post-war problems. One piece of literary work of lasting value was the 'Christian Revolution' Series, a set of substantial books, including Dr. Henry Hodgkin's *Christian Revolution*; Norman Robinson's *Christian Justice*; *Christ and Cæsar*, by Nathaniel Micklem and Herbert Morgan; *The Early Christian Attitude to War*, by Dr. C. J. Cadoux; *Christ and War* and *The Christian Ideal*, by W. E. Wilson; *Reconciliation and Reality*, by W. Fearon Halliday. These books carefully elaborated the whole philosophy of reconciliation and showed what positive Christian pacifism might mean.

The Fellowship in England looks back with thankfulness to the part it was able to play in maintaining the witness of those, including 600 of its own members who, on Christian grounds, refused all war service, to the assistance it was able to give to the relief work promoted by the Society of Friends, to its effort in finding homes in this country for a year for some 1400 Austrian and Hungarian famine children, at once the victims of blockade and ambassadors of peace, and to the further effort to follow these children up and see them established in their own country and kept together in English clubs. The work of the Children's Hospitality

² See *Reconciliation* (F.o.R., 17 Red Lion Square, W.C.1.). Also *The World To-morrow* (New York).

¹ *The Fellowship of Reconciliation Report*, 1931-32.

Committee, which began with the help of the Austrian children, has been continued for the benefit of many others in need through poverty and ill-health; and much good work is being done in providing holidays and in placing Welsh girls in situations. They remember, too, their studies in Christian politics, in the problem of democracy in industry, in prison reform, in education. They are glad of the fellowship and international schools established by members, of experiments in the care of delinquent children and older girls through free discipline and self-government, like 'Riverside' and 'Fairby Grange,' of experiments in sharing like 'the Brethren of the Common Table,' of much experience of worship and prayer together in the spirit that assuredly can be the only lasting foundation for Christian reunion. They rejoice in the high service in the Church itself to which many members have been recalled since the War.

This is not the place to speak of innumerable conferences and campaigns, not even of the Christ and Peace campaign, a considerable interdenominational peace effort led two years ago by the Bishop of Chichester, to which the Fellowship gave the original impetus. Nor is there space to speak of waiting tasks. Members of the F.o.R. unite with many others in anxiety over poverty and discontent at home, violence in the Near East, in Germany, in South America, and closer at hand, over disarmament and economic reconstruction long postponed, and over the League of Nations, so insecurely

based. These things call for a Christian politics and a Christian diplomacy, and chiefly for men who are reconcilers and the makers of real peace. What might not another Söderblom do at this moment between France and Germany?

The Fellowship of Reconciliation, though looking eagerly for the day when the Church as a whole shall have made its special witness unnecessary, feels impelled to try to maintain a focus of peace-making, and to think of itself as something like an order of Christian activists believing in the Kingdom of God 'here and now,' pointing to the way of peace in Christ and seeking to walk in it. It must not over-emphasize one aspect of truth to the exclusion of others, and must realize how challenging to every part of life is the truth it sees. Its guidance and its safeguard lie in the continual reminder as it seeks peace and justice and the ideal community, that 'in Jesus Christ is the true solution of all the problems of the complex world order of to-day.'¹ Its members desire humbly and reverently to urge their Christian brethren not only to recognize that war is incompatible with the way of life to which the gospel calls us, but that the Cross, that supreme 'truth insistence' and 'suffering harmlessness,' while it rejects the whole idea of defence and refuses any guarantee of personal safety, reveals to us the things which belong unto our peace and have so long been hid from our eyes.

¹ *The Fellowship of Reconciliation* (Foundation Statement, 1914).

Loisy's Mémoires.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. SPARROW SIMPSON, D.D., ILFORD.

THE three large volumes of Loisy's autobiography,¹ reaching a sum total of 1700 pages, are much more than the record of an individual career. They contain the completest account we possess of the controversy on Biblical criticism and the Modernist Movement in France. The materials from which the author has made selections were very extensive, but the work would have been improved by condensing. There is much unconscious self-revealing. And whether regarded as a study of the relations between criticism and faith, or of the gradual

disappearance of personal religion, these volumes awaken many serious reflections.

As Professor at the Catholic Institute in Paris, under the presidency of Mgr. d'Hulst, Loisy was associated with Duchesne, whom he criticises severely, and with Vigouroux, Secretary of the Biblical Commission, writer of some twenty volumes of eminently safe, indeed ultra-conservative studies on Scripture. Loisy as a critic was very soon in trouble with the authorities. His independent treatment of Biblical inspiration caused so much alarm that Icard, Head of the College of Saint Sulpice, forbade his students to attend the lectures.

¹ *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire religieuse de notre temps*, 3 vols. (1931).

In a chapter appropriately entitled 'Publications and Tribulations,' Loisy recounts that his opinions on the date of the Proverbs of Solomon were denounced at Rome, with the result that he was unofficially informed that the injury which his opinions inflicted on the literary glory of the Hebrew king was resented in high places, and that if he continued on these lines he would not escape an official condemnation. In spite of the warning, he started a periodical of his own, *L'Enseignement biblique*, intended for the instruction of young priests. Whereupon d'Hulst expressed the hope that the periodical would not become dangerous to its editor. Meantime, Loisy confided to his private diary the reflection that the Church at the present hour was an obstruction to the intellectual development of mankind. Not that this obscurantist influence is necessarily involved in its principles and constitution, but is an abuse which easily springs from them. Loisy assures his readers that he had not yet begun to doubt the essential presuppositions of Catholic Theology. Yet he did not shrink from indicting painful sentences about the sacred legend of Judaism and Christianity, which Duchesne and he, in spite of real or verbal precautions, were labouring to demolish in the interests of Truth.

Further complications arose. D'Hulst, the principal, was sympathetic towards the modern critical school, and anxious to mediate between the conservative and progressive extremes. His biographer, Baudrillart, recorded years ago how greatly d'Hulst appreciated Loisy's learning and ability; but d'Hulst was in a difficult position, and naturally apprehensive about the safety of the Institute. Yet he wanted to be fair to those on the rationalist side. Prompted by conciliatory motives, he published in the *Correspondant* of 1892 an essay on Renan. It was shortly after Renan's death. D'Hulst declared quite uncompromisingly that Renan's philosophical presuppositions had determined his critical conclusions, and that he had outraged the religion recognized by the State; but at the same time d'Hulst admitted that the instruction given in the theological seminaries had been elementary and obsolete. This was followed by another article on the 'Biblical Question,' well meant as an overture for larger toleration, but producing in authoritative circles precisely the contrary effect. In acknowledging the existence of errors in the Bible, d'Hulst risked his own condemnation. There was a storm of opposition. Rome was disturbed. D'Hulst felt obliged to make a pilgrimage and explain in person to the Pope the

motives which prompted his essays. He returned to Paris convinced that if he hoped to avert a public censure he must place the suspected orthodoxy of the Catholic Institute above suspicion. He was forced most reluctantly to inform Loisy that it was impossible to retain him.

This, however, was the time selected by Loisy for publishing in his periodical an article on the 'Inspiration of Scripture,' criticising the view that Divine inspiration necessitates the absolute truth of the inspired word. He declared that non-Catholic critics of the Bible had arrived at a certain number of conclusions which, in all probability, they would never surrender, since they had powerful reasons for regarding them as scientifically verified. Loisy's article put d'Hulst in despair. Cardinal Richard, Archbishop of Paris, was aghast. A meeting of Bishops in Paris decided that Loisy must be dismissed. He resigned his professorship.

Toward the close of the same year, 1893, Leo XIII. issued his Encyclical, 'Providentissimus Deus.' It affirmed that no error is compatible with Divine inspiration. Loisy contended that Divine Authorship is not applicable to a book. Cardinal Richard advised him to suppress his periodical, which after an interval he did. He also wrote a letter to Leo XIII. professing his entire submission to the doctrine of the Encyclical on the study of Holy Scripture. If he expressed himself publicly in the usual deferential terms, he could not resist observing privately that he was not an adept in the art of genuflection. Cardinal Rampolla's reply was to the effect that the Pope had received Loisy's letter with special favour, but advised that the writer should apply his talents to cultivate more particularly some other branch of science. The exasperated recipient of this reply exclaimed, did the Pope and his Secretary of State imagine that you can change your special scientific study as easily as you change your shirt? The sequel was that Cardinal Richard made Loisy chaplain of a Convent School for Girls. There he remained five years.

As to the state of his religious convictions, he says that he did not accept literally any article of the Catholic Creed unless it was, 'Crucified under Pontius Pilate.' He seems to have regarded religion with singular detachment as an immense force which had dominated the history of mankind in the past and seemed destined to dominate it in the future. But of personal religion very little is revealed.

Loisy ceased for a while to publish anything in his own name. But he wrote anonymously over various signatures: either as Fermin, or as Sharp,

or as Jacques Simon, a somewhat fantastic blend of Bossuet's Christian name with the surname of his well-known critical opponent. Anonymity, however, did not shield his writings from official condemnation. The long-established *Journal*, to which he contributed, the '*Revue du Clergé Français*,' now unhappily deceased, received a letter from the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris condemning Loisy's article on the 'Religion of Israel,' and forbidding the publication of the remainder.

The fate of Loisy's most celebrated book, *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, is from any point of view, pathetic. Written to prove that Harnack's reduction of the Essence of Christianity to the solitary doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, could not, on Harnack's own premises, be sustained, Loisy's book was irresistible. His proof that the doctrine of the Kingdom of God was essential to the Teaching of Christ was conclusive.

But the sensation created by this little red book was immense. Troeltsch appreciated it. Von Hügel was deeply sympathetic. Robert Dell¹ said, 'to many of us who are Catholics it seems that M. Loisy has found at least the main lines of a synthesis between faith and criticism.' Batiffol criticised it with great severity. Dr. Inge, the present Dean of St. Paul's, said that 'no intelligent reader can fail to see that M. Loisy's attitude towards the Gospel history is that of rationalism pure and simple. In his *Le Quatrième Evangile* supernatural events are simply set aside as unhistorical; and the same presupposition seems to underlie the argument of his two other books.' Cardinal Richard condemned *L'Evangile et l'Eglise*, as seriously disturbing the faithful on fundamental dogmas of Catholic learning, especially the authority of Scripture and Tradition, the Divinity of Jesus Christ, etc. In 1903 the Congregation of the Holy Office condemned five works of Loisy and placed them on the Index.

Cardinal Merry del Val, Papal Secretary of State, sent a letter to the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, which the latter read to Loisy, requiring immediate and unreserved withdrawal of the five volumes. Loisy informed the Archbishop that this demand was impossible for him to comply with. The Archbishop himself insisted that he must retire to a religious house in order to recover a catholic mentality. This condition appeared to Loisy ludicrous.

Loisy died in Pius x. declaring his desire to live and die in the Communion of the Catholic

Church. He had no wish to contribute to the ruin of the faith in his native land. It was not within his power to efface in himself the results of his studies. But so far as concerned himself he submitted himself to the judgment pronounced against his writing by the Congregation of the Holy Office. As a proof of his goodwill, and to promote peace, he was ready to relinquish his teaching in Paris, and to suspend the publication of the scientific works which he had been preparing.

Loisy's religious creed went to pieces. He said 'Von Hügel believes altogether differently from myself in the divinity of Jesus Christ. Setting metaphysical verbal controversy aside, I no more believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ than does Harnack or Reville. I regard personal incarnation of God as philosophic mythology. Christ holds less place in my religion than in that of liberal Protestants. For I do not attach so much importance as they do to this revelation of the Fatherhood of God. If I have anything in religion it is rather pantheist—positivist—humanitarian than Christian. I do not attribute to the essence of the Gospel that absolute and abiding value which Harnack desires to recognise in it.'

Two years later (1906) Loisy wrote a letter explaining his attitude to Religion, in which he said that the fundamental religious problem of the present time was not whether the Pope was infallible, or whether there were errors in the Bible, or even whether Christ is God, or whether there is a revelation. All these problems are superannuated, or they have changed their meaning, and depend on the one and only great problem whether the Universe is soulless, and the conscience of man finds nothing more real, more true than itself. He concluded with the reflection that faith demands Theism, but reason tends to Pantheism.

In a further letter he repeats Von Hügel's opinion, that reason leads to Monism, but the heart is able to find God. But for himself Loisy cannot find Him. God is for him an ideal projection of human intelligence.

The Encyclical '*Pascendi Dominici Gregis*' of 1907 led to Loisy's exclusion from the Roman Communion. Cardinal Merry del Val, Papal Secretary of State, required him to condemn unreservedly all and each of the propositions condemned by the decree '*Lamentabile*'; and the Modernism condemned by Pius x. in the Encyclical '*Pascendi*.' Loisy replied to this that the decree '*Lamentabile*' contained various extracts from his writings, but with their meaning gravely misrepresented. He could repudiate them, protesting

¹ *Church Times*, 22nd April 1904, p. 531.

against the meaning imported into them. Other extracts seemed to him indisputably true, and it was impossible for him to pronounce them to be false. He was unable to live in the intellectual atmosphere of the decree 'Lamentabile' and the Encyclical 'Pascendi.' The Cardinal reiterated his demand requiring submission within ten days. Loisy refused, and there followed in 1908 his excommunication. He says that the announcement brought him a feeling of genuine relief.

These volumes are by no means concerned only with Biblical Criticism. They are concerned with the problem of the ultimate reality of Religion itself. The author does not confine himself to historical criticism. He introduces his own speculative theories and philosophic presuppositions. He goes far beyond the province which he has made his own, into a province much deeper, and in which there is no reason to credit him with expert capacity or experience. The formidable fact confronts us in these volumes that one after another the advanced critics lose all faith in supernatural religion, and indeed in the personality of God. Margival begins as a priest agreeing with Richard Simon, ends as a layman engaged in a firm of publishers. Marcel Hebert similarly begins as a priest, throws aside his orders, and terminates his career in a vague philosophy of which even Loisy himself confesses its unsatisfactoriness.

When we reflect on the existence of great Theistic Religions independent of Christianity, there is plainly no reason why Biblical Criticism, however advanced or individualist, should end in denial of the personality of God. Are there no grounds in the Natural Universe, and in the intelligent and moral and spiritual capacity of man, to suggest a contrary conclusion? Have not millions rested their religious interpretation of life on these?

Loisy's strenuous indictment of the baleful influence of authoritative restriction on the freedom of the historical critic is powerful and indeed effective. But at the same time the total loss of anything that can be called religion goes far to neutralize his accusation. He seems entirely and strangely unconscious that his negative conclusions provoke reaction towards religion. Biblical Criticism is not necessarily ruinous to faith, nor can criticism ever be an adequate substitute for religion.

No notice of these volumes could reasonably omit a reference to Loisy's friendship with Von Hügel, a friendship extending over more than thirty years. It is superfluous to dwell on Von Hügel's sympathy with Loisy's critical labours, or on the encouragement which he lavished on the French Professor's troubles, or on the efforts which he made in the highest quarters to secure considerate treatment for his friend. Yet it is impossible not to feel that the difference between them was profound. Von Hügel watched with grave concern the diminishing hold of Loisy on anything that can be called Religion. In an impressive, indeed pathetic letter, Von Hügel sees that the line which Loisy is taking will if pursued lead to fuller exposition of his sceptical conclusions. Such a result Von Hügel owned would be very painful, and very harmful to many souls. Yet he had no fear that life's experience would not ultimately lead our fellow-mortals beyond the realm of radical scepticism.¹ To Von Hügel Loisy was the born enemy of the Transcendent, while the Baron 'took the Transcendent under his protection—not, however, that it needed it.' Loisy's influence on religion has become increasingly negative, whereas Von Hügel's last work was to bequeath to mankind his convictions on the Reality of God.

¹ iii. 168.

Literature.

THE SPIRITUAL LIFE.

IN her most recent volume, *The Golden Sequence* (Methuen; 5s. net), Miss Evelyn Underhill sets out her personal conclusions on the principles which are involved in a theology of the Spirit. The book takes its title from the Church's great hymn to the Spirit, the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*, known as the

'Golden Sequence,' and represents an attempt to enter into the meaning of that hymn and to interpret the doctrine which it declares. In the four sections into which the work falls, Spirit, Spiritual Life, Purification, Prayer (the last named being perhaps the most useful to the ordinary reader), the relation between man and God is considered in its various aspects. If some readers

were to complain that little is said in her pages about Fellowship and Service, Miss Underhill would answer that fellowship and service are not the essence but the expression of the spiritual life in man, and that her subject is man's essential spiritual life.

The work reveals Miss Underhill's intimacy with the great spiritual and mystical writers of the past and present, and is marked by fine devotional feeling, depth of thought, and clarity and felicity of expression. We commend it to the notice of devout-minded students of the relationship between 'rapt Spirit and rapt spright.' As an attractive sample of the writing we append the following: 'If the lovely natural scene is like a great fresco where we see the breadth and splendour of the thought of God, the soul is like a little bit of ivory, on which the same Artist works with an intimate and detailed love.'

THE NEW TESTAMENT AS LITERATURE.

Encouraged by the reception of his volume on the Literary Genius of the Old Testament, Mr. P. C. Sands, Head Master of Pocklington School, and late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, has produced a companion volume, *Literary Genius of the New Testament* (Milford; 6s. net). In this volume, which we commend very cordially to students of the Bible, there is evidenced an intimate and loving knowledge of the New Testament writings as well as a just appreciation of their literary value. In some quarters the New Testament is minimized as literature, in others too much is made of it; but here appreciation appears to be critical and discriminating. For example, in asking us to admire Mark's realism, Mr. Sands is careful to say that his style possesses little literary skill or grace, and that his realism is not the realistic power of one who invents his situations and persons, but that of one who possessed or drew upon 'the apt Jewish memory' which all Jewish disciples sought to cultivate. It was a Jewish saying: 'The good disciple is like a cistern, built of concrete, which does not lose one drop.'

In pursuing his theme Mr. Sands takes up the writings of the New Testament in the order of our English version, except that St. Mark's Gospel is treated before St. Matthew's. Particularly fresh and attractive is the chapter on the Epistles of St. Paul. The vigour and fluency of the natural orator are combined in St. Paul with the art and studied devices of the trained orator. His use of simile and metaphor, of question and exclamation, of paradox and epigram, of peroration, of adoration,

and of other oratorical methods besides, is carefully illustrated from his own words. The volume closes with a brief chapter on Translations, in which are considered three good modern versions, Weymouth's, Moffatt's, and the 'Twentieth-Century New Testament.'

THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

This most important work of international history during the Middle Ages planned by the late J. B. Bury, M.A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge, has now reached the seventh or penultimate volume. Its contents are entitled *Decline of Empire and Papacy* (Cambridge University Press; 50s. net). The editor, Dr. C. W. Previté-Orton, F.B.A., Fellow and Librarian of St. John's College, Cambridge, and Dr. Z. N. Brooke have to lament the death of their senior colleague, Dr. J. R. Tanner. Dr. C. W. Previté-Orton has written an admirable introduction to the leading events and characteristics of the fourteenth century. The age is one of stirring and striving more particularly in France, Germany, England, Wales, Scotland, and Ireland. Emperors, popes, kings, and nobles wrestled for the domination of the State; isolated thinkers, writers, and preachers like Wycliffe discussed the positions of the Church and the State; poets like Dante, Petrarch, Chaucer, and others were all of them prominent; the artisans in the towns and the peasants in the country strove tempestuously, if in vain, for a place in the sun. Moreover, it was the era of the Hundred Years' War, of that unspeakable plague the Black Death, that swept across the continent of Europe causing unparalleled devastation in every European country, and not least in Great Britain and Ireland. We read to-day of 'Socialism in our time,' but the fourteenth century had its active socialist propagandists. There is a significant chapter in this volume on 'Peasant Life and Rural Conditions from 1100 to 1500,' by Miss Eileen E. Power, D.Lit., Professor of Economic History in the University of London, one of three women scholars who make notable contributions to its contents. 'It was not until after the middle of the fourteenth century,' Professor Power writes, 'that peasant risings became both frequent and general, sometimes assuming the proportions of a real "green revolution."' The Peasants' Revolt in England (1381), perhaps the most interesting of all, gradually drew into its scope every smouldering grievance of the working classes in town and country alike. There were

similar revolts in France, in Spain, and, in fact, in every part of Europe. This effervescence in the rural world was accompanied by the appearance of a new spirit in the countryside, something of more universal significance than the old revolt against burdensome dues and services. This new spirit, half religious and half socialistic, is very marked in the English Peasants' Revolt and in some of the German Movements. Dreams of a reform in the Church were in the heads of English peasants in 1381. The remarkable English poem of Piers Plowman sounds a new note in medieval literature. Moreover, Froissart's description of the preaching of the wandering priest, John Ball, reads very like the socialist denunciations of to-day: 'Ah, ye good people, the matters goeth not well to pass in England, nor shall not do till everything be common and that there be no villains nor gentlemen, but that we may all be united together, and that the lords be no greater masters than we be. We be all come from one father and one mother, Adam and Eve; whereby can they say or shew that they be greater lords than we be, saving by that they cause us to win and labour for that they dispend.' The sentiments of the fourteenth century read very like those of the twentieth. There is a very fine chapter—one of the finest in the volume—by Mr. Arthur A. Tilley, M.A. Fellow of King's College, Cambridge, on 'The Early Renaissance,' in which he draws for us a vivid portrait of Petrarch. 'Here we have brought face to face the man who may be said to have inaugurated the medieval world and "the first modern man," the representative of the ascetic self-suppression of the Middle Ages and the representative of the cultivated individualism of the Renaissance.' It is impossible in a brief notice to do justice to a work of this magnitude and general excellence. In keeping with their character the essays are accompanied by elaborate bibliographies, a chronological table, full index, and last, but most important, a set of a dozen maps.

A NEW SERIES.

Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton have begun a series of apologetic volumes under the name 'The Westminster Books'—so called because the original proposal was made at a small Committee which met under the shadow of Westminster Abbey. Quite a number of similar series have seen the light in recent times. But these were mostly booklets—the 'Westminster' series is composed of books, well printed and bound, at 3s. net each.

Two volumes have just appeared and others are announced. Our appetite is whetted by such promises as these: 'Does God do anything?' by the Bishop of Liverpool, 'Does God care?' by Dean Matthews, and 'Why be good?' by the Rev. James Reid.

The first volume is by one of the editors, Archdeacon Storr, and the subject is *Do Dead Men Live Again?* It is a curiously worded title, but the topic is live enough. The author confesses that neither religion nor philosophy can demonstrate the fact of human survival. The most either can do is to show the inherent reasonableness of the belief. The Archdeacon offers four such arguments—the general, if not universal, character of the belief; the fact that personality is the goal of creation, and cannot well be destroyed; the eternal and spiritual nature of 'values' in which man shares; and the moral claim on God for the redressing of the inequalities of this life. The second of these was urged by Professor Pringle Pattison in his Gifford Lectures, the last by Browning in 'La Saisiaz.' The most original and most interesting part of the book is the chapter on 'Soul,' along with that on 'Spiritual Bodies.' There is real intellectual light in these chapters, which contain a sustained argument that makes both soul and spiritual body credible and reasonable. In the last two chapters on Conditional Immortality and Spiritualism the author is expository and inconclusive. On the whole the book gives the series an excellent start.

The second volume in the series is by the Rev. S. A. McDowall, B.D., on *Is Sin our Fault?* The author rightly asserts that the central problem here is the nature of freedom, and a large part of the book is devoted to that point. Alongside this is the question: 'Must goodness take first place?' that is to say, before truth and beauty. The argument on freedom is not easy to follow; indeed, this may be said of the book as a whole. The treatment is fresh and able, but it is not nearly simple enough for the people to whom this series appeals. All the main interests connected with the moral situation are passed in review—conscience, sin and original sin, freedom and free-will, and finally atonement. There is a clever and annihilating answer to determinism on p. 101 f., and all through the book is suggestive, but it needs an attentive hearing.

WHAT IS WRONG WITH OUR EDUCATION?

The Editor of an educational paper in Switzerland invited his readers to send him answers to

the simple question: 'From what did you suffer most at school?' The response led to two results. One was that the paper lost four hundred of its subscribers at once, probably teachers. The other was that Dr. Willi Schohaus, Director of the Training College at Kreuzlingen, selected seventy-eight of the most typical 'reports,' classified them, prefaced them by a long essay of his own, and published the whole in a volume which has just been translated into English: *The Dark Places of Education* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). The reader may be wise to follow the advice of Dr. Ballard, who writes an enthusiastic foreword, and read first the 'reports' of former pupils on their sufferings, on pp. 123-330, and afterwards Dr. Schohaus's essay.

The author does not spare either our educational system or the teaching profession. Briefly, his criticisms (based on his material) are as follows. The fault of the school is its detachment from life; it is not efficient for living. Very many pupils endure sufferings at school which are a nightmare to them. This is partly due to the character of the teacher, and sometimes to his ignorance. Further, teaching is too abstract. There is too much worship of mere learning. Education is regarded as an end in itself, and the child's mind is sometimes filled with rubbish. The discipline is often bad. The moral training is generally bad—the ideas of the teacher being forced on the pupil. The personality of the child is neglected. The pupils are all pruned to the same pattern. Finally, there is a drastic treatment of the teacher's faults—partiality, autocracy, sarcasm, and resort to corporal punishment.

There is a great deal of wholesome medicine here for teachers. If they have the grace to read this book with some humility, they will swallow the medicine with a wry face, but with healthful results. All the same, a word of caution ought to be uttered about the use made of such 'questionnaires' as we find here. They are on the whole a bad way of reaching truth, bad because ineffective. The answers to such questions are given from all sorts of motives, and are rarely a reliable account of facts. They are one-sided, they may be merely malicious, and they are a poor foundation for generalizations. All the same, there is much wisdom in the criticisms and suggestions of this able book.

A work of a totally different kind, and even more aggressively critical, is *Education and the Social Order*, by Mr. Bertrand Russell (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). In one respect at least the writer

agrees with Dr. Schohaus—that two of the conditions of sound education are good teachers and small classes. To Mr. Russell, however, the main defects of our educational system are due to private property and the patriarchal family. He is not an altogether convinced communist indeed, for he points out very frankly the weaknesses of the communist philosophy. The school, under communism, he confesses, is to be an instrument of class domination as much as it is with us, only in the hands of the proletariat; and there is no moral teaching other than what is useful to the workers in the class struggle. It would seem to follow (says Mr. Russell) that when the proletariat achieves final victory there will be no morality at all. Mr. Russell, however, is a great believer in freedom in education. Children should be allowed to call their parents fools, to swear if they like, to talk about what to 'inhibited adults' seems indecent. 'Given such conditions, children may grow up fearless and fundamentally happy.' Mr. Russell deals with many subjects in this book—sex, the herd, the family, religion, competition, economics—all as they affect education. He is always interesting, and often irritating because of an absurd dogmatism about things he dislikes. His description of Pragmatism, for example, on p. 23 is ludicrously unfair, and the very idea of religion rouses the worst in him. His book is not nearly so useful as that of Dr. Schohaus because it is doctrinaire and individualistic, but it should be read all the same.

THE LUTTERWORTH PAPERS.

The Religious Tract Society under its new name, 'The Lutterworth Press,' is launching out on new ventures. Among these is a series of booklets, price 3d. each, by well-known writers on aspects of Christian faith and life. The most interesting is one by Dr. Karl Barth called *Questions to Christendom*. These questions are as follows: (1) Does Christendom see and understand that it is faced to-day with a whole series of alien religions different from those of the past? (communism, fascism, 'Americanism,' new Islam). (2) Is Christendom herself quite clear that she has nothing else to expect from these 'religions' but war to the knife? (3) Does Christendom know how near to her lies the temptation, by a slight betrayal of her proper business, to escape such an imminent conflict with those alien 'religions'? Does she know that this must not happen? Does she know that under no circumstances must she howl with

the wolves? (4) Does the present situation, the conflict with the new and old 'religions,' plant Christendom finally and chiefly face to face with the question: '*Does she know herself?*' Barth on these questions, even with such brevity, is cheap at threepence. Other issues are *The Oxford Group: A First Century Christian Fellowship*, by Mr. F. W. Rowlands, B.A.; *Who do Men say that I am?* by the Rev. R. Birch Hoyle; *Not Far from Every One of Us*, by Mr. Hugh Redwood; *Protestantism: Its Fundamental Basis*, by the Rev. R. Mercer Wilson, M.A.; *Christian Reasons*, by Mr. A. Donald Miller; and *Zinzendorf*, by the Rev. W. Y. Fullerton, D.D.

'After all, language was given us, despite the witty Frenchman's epigram, to express and not to conceal our thoughts, and to express them as clearly and unmistakably as may be. The very greatest poetry and prose always have the mark of clarity.' It is with a desire to aid, among others, writers of sermons and preachers who preach extemporarily to act on the principle of the foregoing sentence, that the Rev. Henry Bett, M.A., Professor of Church History in Handsworth College, Birmingham, has written a most appropriate volume entitled *Some Secrets of Style* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net). Professor Bett has already given proof of his qualifications as a capable guide in a smaller volume, '*How to write Good English.*' The present volume, we are told, is the result of many years of a careful reading and study of the best classical and modern literature, and all who read it will admit the claim. In an introductory chapter he points out that there are writers whose powers of thought are greater than their powers of expression and whose writings may be immortal. On the other hand, there are writers whose gift of expression is far in excess of their other intellectual powers and whose writings may achieve a minor immortality in literature merely by the grace and beauty of their language. All style, he insists, is a question of the apt word, and there is often a word that is supremely apt. 'The gift that enables a writer to find this apt word may make him immortal even though his other gifts are few.' 'Anything that deserves to be called great literature must be the fine expression of fine thought.' Professor Bett draws many of his illustrative quotations from the poetry of Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Browning, though

of the last he is also critical. He is especially critical of Dryden and Pope. Why is the eighteenth century, he asks, the dreariest period in English literature? There is probably as much mere thought and naked truth in the verse and prose of that century as in those of any other. It is the vicious style of the period that has doomed it. We are accustomed in these days to read of school-boy 'howlers,' but Professor Bett in his wide reading has found 'howlers' perpetrated by the most eminent authors. He draws the line at theologians. The latter will find their gifts of expression aided by a reading of this most suggestive book.

Living Issues in China, by Mr. Henry T. Hodgkin (Allen & Unwin; 5s. net), is a most interesting and thought-provoking book. The writer has not only travelled widely in China, but has done years of missionary spade work. Writing out of a full knowledge he gives a survey of China's problems, political and international, educational, social, and religious. Perhaps the most attractive feature of this survey is its fair-mindedness. It is fitted to allay prejudice, to quicken missionary zeal, and to stir sympathy with those who are facing an incredibly difficult situation. In the concluding chapters Mr. Hodgkin has some very suggestive things to say about the growth of the indigenous Chinese Church and the relation of the gospel to the ethnic religions and the world movements of to-day.

After carefully reading *The Truth about India*, by the Rev. Verrier Elwin (Allen & Unwin; 1s. net), we are left anxiously asking the question of the sub-title 'Can we get it?' Father Elwin is a whole-hearted supporter of Mahatma Gandhi and the Congress, and a vigorous critic of the Indian Government. He certainly brings forward grave evidence of alienation between Government and the majority of educated people in India. But when, in claiming complete independence for India, he says that the solution of the problem 'is not really difficult,' one is led to feel that he is rather a dreamer than a practical statesman. With the sorrows of the Chinese Republic before the eyes of the world, the most ardent friend of India may well hesitate to believe that the destiny of India's millions has only to be committed forthwith to Mr. Gandhi and all will be well.

The number of medical men who become clergy-

men is relatively very few. There is a notable case in that of the Rev. Dr. Charles W. Budden, who after twenty-five years' active experience as a medical man has taken holy orders and is now Vicar of St. Mildred's, Croydon, in the Primate's diocese of Canterbury. It is out of his experience as a doctor that Dr. Budden has just published an arresting little volume entitled *One Hundred Popular Fallacies* (John Bale, Sons & Danielsson; 3s. 6d. net). These fallacies affect life from the cradle to the grave, and Dr. Budden has the literary gift that enables him to write clearly, pithily, pungently, and with a good deal of humour. He admits having mischievously poked fun at nurses, doctors, parents, and friends, but where he deals with quacks it is with irony and scorn. It is a book that should be in every home, the richest and especially the poorest. They are duly numbered, these popular fallacies, and in every case Dr. Budden sticks to his text. He writes as one having authority and who has been a Medical Officer of Health. Take as a sample: 'That alcohol increases efficiency.' 'Scientific research has put beyond question that this drug even in moderate quantities diminishes the output of muscular work.' 'It is now established beyond all reasonable doubt that the value of alcohol as a food in ordinary conditions of life is practically nil, but it seems able, on occasions, to tide over a period of sickness when ordinary food cannot be absorbed.' Another fallacy that Dr. Budden feels delight in exposing is 'that rice pudding is wholesome.' 'As a child I loathed rice pudding, and was always made to eat it and to suffer subsequent discomfort in consequence. I did not know then that the medical science of the twentieth century would justify my dislike and exonerate me from all blame.' It will startle most mothers to learn that children should have parties is a popular fallacy. 'The children's party is one of the banes of childhood, and its effect is almost wholly bad.' Dr. Budden is always courageous and confident, and lays down the law, as he says, with uncommon sense even for one of that highly trained profession.

The Near East (1s. net) is one of a series of short handbooks published by the Church Missionary Society to give information and rouse interest in mission work in 'Africa and the East.' The present book deals with the Muhammadan world, particularly Arabia, Egypt, and the Sudan, Palestine, and Persia. It is written with intentional simplicity and directness so that the general reader without previous knowledge may find in it what he wants.

The narrative is brightened by several excellent photographs.

The commemoration of the death of Sir Walter Scott, a century ago, has taken no more remarkable form than the number and variety of the books it has called forth, from the notable biography by Mr. John Buchan, M.P., and the character study by Mr. John A. Patten to the volumes of unpublished Letters edited by Professor Grierson. The story of Scott's life is being read to-day as if it were that of a contemporary, and as if the present generation had been witnesses of its pathetic close. His poems and many of his novels were still being widely read by the generation of fifty years ago. Of the works of how many popular authors can as much be said? People still living learnt the history of Scotland from Scott's 'Tales of a Grandfather.' They can also remember when the dramatized version of 'Rob Roy' long filled the bill of the Edinburgh theatre, and when the 'Bride of Lammermoor' was a no less popular opera. Scott the man and the chief of his creations in poetry and fiction still have a living interest and are assured of an enduring place in the history of our Literature. Among the recent publications called forth by the centenary, *Scott and the Lure of the Road*, by the Rev. P. Laurence K. Mudie (James Clarke; 5s. net), makes an attractive and arresting appeal. Mr. Mudie says it has been a literary recreation for many years to go over the actual ground associated with the best known of Scott's novels and in this way to gather the real background of each. Thus we have 'Old Mortality and Lanarkshire,' 'Rob Roy on his Native Heath,' 'Guy Mannering and Galloway,' 'With the Antiquary in Angus—The Scottish East Coast,' 'The Bride of Lammermoor—Wigtownshire and East Lothian,' 'The Abbot and Loch Leven.' He has read widely and critically and shows himself a most competent guide. He would feign give us his opinion at length on the question, 'What is Scott's religion?' but is content to answer: 'It is a faith of acceptance, not of theological analysis. The problems that harass the psychologist in his study do not exist for Walter Scott. His faith is primarily not one of thought but of action.' Mr. Mudie has gone a long way towards the fulfilment of his object of kindling in his readers his own enthusiasm for Scott's fiction.

Pioneers of the Kingdom, Part I., by Phyllis L. Garlick (Highway Press; 2s. net), 'is the first of two sets of lessons attempting to show that the

Christian adventure which had its beginnings in the Acts of the Apostles has been carried on down the ages by a succession of missionary heroes who have shared the same compelling motive.' These lessons are planned for children of eleven to fourteen, and teachers will find in them a great deal of excellent material. The missionary heroes whose work is described are Patrick, Columba, Augustine, Aidan, Boniface, Anskar, Ulphilas, Vladimir, Francis, and Raimon Lull. They form a galaxy whose adventures and achievements should fire the imagination and enthusiasm of the young.

The number of ministers who publish their sermons to-day is small, but happily among them is Dr. J. D. Jones, C.H. The title of his latest volume is *Richmond Hill Sermons*, from the name of the great Congregational Church in Bournemouth, where he preaches week by week and year by year, sermons fresh and full of thought. Those in this volume have created more than the usual interest, the publishers say. The themes are varied, and the space given to each—there are only sixteen sermons—adequate for the development of the thought. The price of 5s. net (Hodder & Stoughton) should ensure Dr. Jones' message reaching a large number. There are some errata which should receive attention in a second edition.

The volume may be sampled in 'The Christ of the New Testament and the Christ of To-day,' which we give, though in abridged form, in 'The Christian Year' this month.

Christmas is not very far away, and we are glad to know of books that may be given to the children at such a time. The Lutterworth Press send two excellent examples. One is *Stories of Jesus for Mothers to Tell*, by Mrs. Elfreyda M. C. Wightman (7s. 6d. net). The gospel story is gone over very simply and beautifully, with a judicious and justifiable use of imagination, but always adhering closely to the text. What is quite new in such a volume, however, and very welcome, is the addition (after each story) of a section for the children, containing simple prayers and suggestions for 'expression work,' as well as a section for the mothers, with useful information on matters of faith or guidance about the moral religious meanings of the stories. The book is beautifully printed and bound, and has a large number of coloured plates. This is one of the very best of such books we have seen, both for the vivid power of storytelling and for the delightful appendices to which reference has been made.

The other book is *The Children's Jesus*, by Miss Noël E. Nicholl, with twenty-four coloured plates (2s. 6d. net). Miss Nicholl is one of the most competent members of the staff of the Youth Committee of the Church of Scotland, a skilled teacher with a knowledge of child nature. It is pleasant to find her devoting her gifts to the very youngest children. The stories in her book are told with the utmost simplicity, and in direct, picturesque language. They will be a great help to teachers of 'primaries,' as well as to others who work with the infant stage. Both books are worthy of all praise.

The Man God Uses, by the Rev. Oswald J. Smith (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d.), contains a series of addresses in which an impassioned appeal is made for full surrender to the Spirit, separation from the world, and whole-hearted Christian service. The addresses are what the Americans call 'inspirational' rather than instructive, but there is certainly a fervour about them which many readers will find stimulating.

In the Annual Philosophical Lecture under the Henriette Hertz Trust delivered before the British Academy in 1932, Mr. H. A. Prichard considers the subject of *Duty and Ignorance of Fact* (Milford; 1s. 6d. net). The question which he raises is one which does not trouble us much, if at all, in practical life, and it is apt to be only casually treated at the best by the theorist. Yet it is of importance for theory at any rate. It may be thus stated: 'If a man has an obligation, i.e. a duty, to do some action, does the obligation depend on certain characteristics of the situation in which he is, or on certain characteristics of his thought about the situation?' The first alternative implies an objective view of duty, the second a subjective. A clear and sober discussion of the question leads Mr. Prichard to conclude that the subjective view better corresponds with our ordinary thought, but that it is exposed to various difficulties. If, however, we allow, as he thinks we must, that an obligation must be an obligation not to do something, but to set ourselves to do something, we have to modify accordingly not only the original question, but also both the alternative views of the basis of an obligation.

Pastoral Psychiatry and Mental Health, by the Rev. John Rathbone Oliver, D.D., M.D. (Scribner's; 8s. 6d. net), contains the Hale Lectures for 1932. It is a very full and excellent treatment of the whole

subject of mental illness in its connexion with morals and religion. From the medical point of view it is thoroughly accurate and reliable, while it is written with a lucidity which makes it very understandable. Perhaps the most valuable part of the work is the great amount of clinical material which is given, enabling the general reader from the record of a large number of illustrative cases to form some idea of the variety and complexity of mental disorders. The ordinary pastor, fortunately, does not meet such cases every day, but it is well that he should know of their existence and be prepared to deal with them wisely when they do occur. The book can be confidently recommended as a sane and helpful treatment of the whole subject of mental and sexual maladjustment.

A work by an American Professor on the Person and ministry of Jesus Christ claims to offer 'a new point of view.' The book is *The Re-interpretation of Jesus in the New Testament*, by Professor Carl E. Puriton, Ph.D. (Scribner's; 7s. 6d. net), and the claim is a large one to be made to-day. As a matter of fact, the book is an interesting study, first of the sources of our knowledge of Jesus, then of His ministry, and finally of the different interpretations of Him to be found in New Testament books—Paul, John, Hebrews, Acts, and Revelation. There is nothing very novel in the book, but it is all readable, not very thorough but good sound

work, a useful kind of introduction to the New Testament presentation of Jesus.

Volumes innumerable have been written on prayer, but the subject remains ever fresh with its problems, and elusive in its essential mystery. *Prayer: Its Mysteries and Methods*, by the Rev. J. A. Clapperton, M.A. (Sharp; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of wise guidance for devout souls. It touches upon the difficulties that have been raised by physical science and the reign of law, but the reasoning here is not profound nor likely to carry conviction to the unbelieving mind. The strength of the book lies in its wealth of Scriptural teaching and of practical suggestions for the ordering of the prayer life. It should prove most helpful to all who need guidance and encouragement in the practice of prayer.

The New Reformation, by A. K. (Stockwell; 3s. 6d. net), contains a collection of short letters from a Quaker to a Fundamentalist intended to convince the latter that his view of the Word of God is erroneous and that he should give more heed to the Inner Light. It is difficult to believe that any Christian to-day has so crude a conception of the Word of God as this Fundamentalist is represented as having. The argument of the letters is slight, and very little positive contribution is made to the elucidation of this great subject.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

BY THE REVEREND J. W. JACK, D.D., GLENFARG, PERTHSHIRE.

HITHERTO we have been accustomed to think of Sumer and Egypt as the most ancient cradles of civilized life. But now, according to Sir John Marshall, such marvellous discoveries have been made at Mohenjo-Daro that the Indus may have to be regarded as more original than the Nile or the Tigris. There is evidence that caravans with precious stones and valuable manufactured goods were crossing the mountain barriers from India westward to Mesopotamia five thousand years ago, many centuries before Abraham was born. Numerous objects with writing on them have been unearthed. These contain ideographic signs, such as lie at the foundation of Egyptian, Sumerian, and Chinese

writing. Though not yet translated, the appearance of the script shows that it has to do with forestry, canals, water-supply, transport, trade, and government. We thus have a view of an active world, corresponding to a high development of civilization, long before the ancestors of the Hebrews left the steppes of Arabia. The discovery has enlarged the domain of Eastern archaeology, and may yet throw considerable light on the early pottery, figurines, seals, and similar material unearthed in Babylonia, Syria, and Palestine.

This extension of the origins of civilization adds interest to the excavations which are being conducted at Nineveh and other places in the Tigris-

Euphrates regions. At Nineveh, which fell before the Scythians in 612 B.C. (its fall was prophesied by Nahum, and by Zephaniah, 2¹³⁻¹⁵), excavation has been going on for many years, ever since Layard found the great palace of Sennacherib. A few months ago, Mr. R. Campbell Thomson announced that the Temple of Ishtar had at last been discovered after years of research by himself and others. Now he reports that he has succeeded in digging a great pit, about ninety feet deep, down to virgin soil, thus reaching the earliest Ninevite settlement. Not far from the lowest depths, below several strata of pluvial deposit, he came on a series of brilliantly painted pottery fragments, many of them in three colours, with geometric patterns, in lustrous red and black; while at the bottom, under the vast accumulation of débris, he found plain and incised ware belonging to a civilization that cannot be much later than 5000 B.C. Among finds in an adjoining field was a perfect prism of Esarhaddon, which describes the events after the murder of his father Sennacherib, and thus adds to the information we have in 2 K 19^{36, 37} (= Is 37^{37, 38}).

If the Exodus took place about 1445 B.C., as an increasing number of scholars seem to hold, the Pharaoh at the time was Amenophis II. Some interesting information regarding his wife, who was a daughter of Thutmose III., is now afforded us by Mr. H. E. Winlock, the Director of the expedition which discovered her mummy at Thebes in 1929. She died about 1440 B.C., and her tomb was found to have been robbed twice, some four hundred years after her burial, but on each occasion it had been officially restored and resealed. An examination of her mummy shows that she was not more than fifty at the time of her death. She was of short stature, rather slender, and with a delicately formed figure. She wore bracelets and armlets, and one or more chaplets on her brow. Her head was large, with wavy brown hair, having no trace of grey. As it was the Egyptian fashion in her day for the women to give as much fulness to their hair as possible, she had padded it out by adding innumerable false braids of human hair, of the same colour as her own. Amenophis II. continued to reign for some twenty years after her death, and was interred in the Valley of the Kings. His tomb was discovered in 1898, and his body rests there to this day.

In Palestine excavators are busy. At Samaria, which may be regarded as the greatest site connected with the age of the monarchy, work has been progressing rapidly. Among other valuable objects,

some important carved ivories have been found. Most of these bear representations of Egyptian gods, while two represent winged cherubim, one in pierced relief pictures a bull being mauled by a lion, and others, again, have decorative patterns, bands of lotus-flowers and buds, and complicated designs of the sacred tree type. Mr. Crowfoot regards the whole group as closely related in characteristics and date to the ivories found in 1928 at Arslan Tash, near Carchemish (these latter are not unlike some ivories found by Layard at Nineveh). The strata in which they were discovered is about one hundred metres north-east of the 'Osorkon house,' in a spot full of Israelite potsherds of the eighth and ninth centuries B.C. Some of them probably belong to Ahab's reign (c. 875-853 B.C.), when there was a great display of pomp and luxury, with many 'ivory houses' (i.e. houses panelled or decorated with this substance, Am 3¹⁵). The Egyptian and Babylonian monuments refer to the widespread trade in ivory, and Ahab and his successors in Samaria must have had no difficulty in securing sufficient quantities of this material from Tyre, which was the principal centre of the trade (Ezk 27^{6, 15}). The king of Damascus had an ivory bed (cf. Am 6⁴, where such beds are mentioned), and a massive ivory throne which Adad-nirari III. carried off as booty, and Solomon possessed an ivory throne overlaid with gold (1 K 10¹⁸).

At Megiddo a most remarkable discovery was made not long ago by Mr. Guy. A wide hollow full of rubbish was cleared, and found to extend through all the various strata down to the rock. When cleared, it formed a huge crater with a stairway down the side. At the rock it changes into a vertical square shaft, about sixty feet deep, and twenty feet square. From this a sloping tunnel leads farther down to a spring at the foot of the hill. Here there is a narrow opening to the outside, beside which was found the skeleton of the doorkeeper, with a large mace-head of bronze beside him, reminding us forcibly of the skeleton of the Roman sentinel found at Pompeii. In this way the internal water-supply of the city was assured. The long, steep, slippery stairway speaks painfully of the work laid upon the 'drawers of water' among the conquered Canaanites (cf. Dt 29¹¹, Jos 9^{21, 27}). We have an illustration of the same in the water-supply at Gezer, where there was a gigantic staircase (dating, it is believed, from Neolithic times), 219 feet long, cut in the rock, and leading down to a powerful spring with a pool of great depth, and another illustration in the staircase tunnel which

ran down from the top of the hill now called the Castle of Es-Salt, in Transjordania.

Dr. Gabriel Welter, who has been excavating at Shechem (*Balâtah*, a little south of *Nâblus*) on behalf of the German Archæological Institute, has recently given us further interesting reports. The town, it is known, was strategically placed between Mounts Gerizim and Ebal, so as to block the pass on the ancient highway from the Jordan, and thus protect the coastal regions from Eastern invaders. The gigantic wall, discovered to be double, with a thirty-five feet earth slope between the two, has now been entirely laid bare, and is traceable in an unbroken circuit, enclosing a city area of fifteen acres, making one of the largest fenced cities in Palestine. The complex of the walls appears to have been about sixty-five feet high and fifty feet thick. One can understand how the Israelites, on hearing the report of the spies in Kadesh-Barnea ('The cities are great and walled up to heaven'), felt in their own sight as 'grasshoppers.' If it be the case, as the excavator thinks, that the fortifications date from the fourteenth century B.C., it is possible that they may have been constructed by Labaya (probably another form of the name Levi), who figures so much in the Amarna Letters of that date. We know from these Letters that his dominion extended from the Plain of Esdraelon to Gezer, and that he probably resided at Shechem. It was through his instrumentality that the *Habiru* (or Hebrews) took possession of the town at the time of the Conquest. It is a strange coincidence, perhaps, that Levi is associated in the Biblical narrative with Shechem (Gn 34).

Further particulars have been received regarding the pavement discovered in the Tyropœon Valley, adjoining ancient Jerusalem. The pavement, which lies about nineteen feet below the present surface, is four feet wide. It stretches along the side of a street of diagonally laid flags, some of which are striated at right angles to the line of the street, while others are worn smooth with use. It is composed of alternately wide and narrow slabs, the latter leaving a hiatus of some eighteen inches beyond their inner edge. The engineers who made the discovery (they happened to be laying new drainage) raised a broken slab and sunk a shaft of about five feet in width. They found that the filling immediately below consisted of a damp clayey earth, which yielded, in sifting, large quantities of sherds uniformly of hard fine ware, red and buff, belonging to the Roman or earliest Byzantine period. Six coins were also discovered, two of which are of procurators dating A.D. 10 and 18 respec-

tively; a third, though illegible, is probably of the same period; while the remainder are Arab. Large quantities of potsherds were also found above the pavement, dating from the Byzantine period downward.

All doubt as to whether *Tell en-Nasbeh*, where Professor W. F. Badé has been excavating, is actually the Biblical fortress of Mizpah seems now to have been removed by the discovery in a tomb there of a beautifully worked agate seal, inscribed in Hebrew characters, showing that the occupant was none other than 'Yaazanyahu' (*i.e.* Jaazaniah), one of king Zedekiah's principal officers, who, we know from Scripture, came to Mizpah (cf. 2 K 25²³, Jer 40⁸) along with other leaders to give in his allegiance to Gedaliah, the governor of Judah appointed by Nebuchadrezzar. The name is spelt on the seal exactly as in the Biblical record, and beneath it are the words 'Servant of the King,' accompanied by a well-etched design of a crowing cockerel. If the mound be really Mizpah, it becomes one of the most fascinating Biblical sites in Palestine. The hill on which Mizpah stood was regarded as sacred. It was here that Samuel gathered Israel to choose their first king. Here the tabernacle remained for about fifty-seven years, until the dedication of the temple of Jerusalem; and here there was, according to 1 Mac 3⁴⁶, an ancient Israelite 'place of prayer,' such a spot as there was perhaps on the Mount of Olives (2 S 15³², RV).

In a previous review we mentioned, in connexion with the excavations of Pères Mallon and Köppel at *Teleilat Ghassul* and neighbouring sites, that a large number of 'inscribed pebbles' had been discovered. Closer study has convinced the excavators that these are not authentic. They recognize now only two of them as genuine, the remainder being clever imitations (Shapira *redivivus*?). Any further discussion as to their meaning is unnecessary. The black basalt stela discovered at *Khirbet Balwah*, in Moab, with human figures on it and several lines of ancient inscription, is believed by Horsefield (the discoverer), and Père Vincent to represent some Moabite king being introduced by the goddess Ashtar to the god Chemosh (whom the Israelites called 'the abomination of the Moabites'), in order to seek his help under some national peril, or thank him for some great deliverance. The inscription, which consists of four horizontal lines, is placed, contrary to custom, in the narrow conical space at the top, above the figures, and is so worn with age as to be quite undecipherable, though some of the letters,

so far as the writer can judge from a copy, appear not unlike the much-discussed Sinaitic ones. The stela has been dated sometime between Thutmose III. and Merenptah (*i.e.* between 1501 and 1215 B.C.), several centuries before the well-known Moabite Stone. Is it possible that it may be concerned with the approach of the Israelites to the Promised Land? It is not unlikely that the Moabite prince, Balak, the son of Zippor, had recourse to his national gods Chemosh and Ashtart. Was the event perhaps commemorated afterwards by this imposing monument, placed in some sanctuary at *Balukah*?

A series of Stone Age deposits, so far unparalleled in the Near East, has been discovered by Mr. MacCown in the Valley of the Caves at the foot of Mount Carmel. A Mousterian cemetery, twenty thousand years old and more, has been unearthed. It is the most extensive mid-Pleistocene graveyard that has been discovered so far. It is the same stratum in which the skeleton of a child was found last year. Now eight complete or partial skeletons

of other individuals have been discovered. According to Sir Arthur Keith, these prove that the ancient Palestinians were a distinctive people unlike any other race of prehistoric men. They resemble the Neanderthals of Europe (the strange race that became extinct long before the end of the last Ice Age), and yet show many features also which link them to the aborigines of Australia. This newly found type of humanity, which has been given the name *Palæanthropus Palestinus*, serves to bridge the gap between the Neanderthals and the primitive forms of modern man. As the deposits have been found on a ledge of Mount Carmel, one cannot help thinking of the great scene when Elijah and his servant looked from the summit of the hill away over the Levant for some cloud which might betoken rain for Ahab's parched plains. Down below him, as he sat there, was the ledge where this strange family of people had been sleeping for countless thousands of years, and now, three thousand years later than Elijah himself, they have come to light.

Silence in Heaven.

BY THE REVEREND W. ERNEST BEET, D.LITT., F.R.HIST.S., HYTHE.

'WHEN he opened the seventh seal, there was silence in heaven for about half an hour' (Rev 8¹)—thus does the episode of the Seals reach its dramatic climax. What exactly that climax really means sets a problem for which no entirely satisfactory solution has yet been found, and perhaps never will. But the quest is fascinating, and though finality may be beyond our present attainment, the effort is at least worth while.

The saying is undoubtedly a hard one, and any interpretation offered must be conjectural at best. It may be advisable to enter upon our study with a passing glance at some of the suggestions which have already been put forward, though anything like detailed consideration or criticism would transgress the necessary limits of this paper. The suggested interpretations must, in general, be allowed to speak for themselves. They are, for the most part, solutions proposed by recent expositors, among whom may be named Milligan, Charles, Swete, and C. A. Scott.

Some writers have expressed uncertainty as to

the extent or range of the silence. The cessation, it is argued, may include that of song, but more probably has reference to the lightnings and the threatening sounds which accompany it. That is to say, it indicates a brief suspension of judgment to call attention to the manifestations of wrath to follow. But surely silence means silence if it means anything at all, and any solution along these lines appears to me, on this and other grounds, singularly unconvincing, especially in view of the fact that, so far as the sacred record is concerned, the silence seems to interrupt the song. Much more plausible is the conjecture that 8² is out of place and that vv. 3-5 should immediately follow v. 1. This suggests that the praises and thanksgivings of heaven are hushed in order that the prayers of the suffering saints on earth may secure uninterrupted hearing before the Throne of Grace. Attractive as it is, in some respects, this interpretation is hardly adequate to account for the dramatic splendour of the interruption—a remark which applies still more strongly to the suggestion that silence does not

express cessation of the Divine workings, but a temporary cessation of revelation, intended to give the seer time to take in what he had heard or seen. Yet another view is that the silence connotes wistful or alarmed uncertainty; big with fate, it is described as conveying, as nothing else could, the sense of trembling suspense. This impresses me as being neither adequate nor obvious, as likewise the somewhat similar idea of a pause of terrified astonishment, as though the dwellers in heaven drew their breath in an anguish of expectation—the stillness which portends the breaking of the storm. Of a totally different character is the contention that the preceding visions have described events leading up to the coming of Christ; when they are ended He does come, but His coming is not described. Here it is passed over in silence. Against this it may be argued that, so far as the Seals episode is concerned, something very like an advent in judgment has already been described (6¹²⁻¹⁷); and what is certainly intended to represent God's final reckoning with men meets us in a later phase of the apocalyptic vision (20¹¹). There appears to be no ground for the assumption that it is implicit in the statement of 8¹, while any mention of the fact is deliberately suppressed. One may well ask why reticence here with reference to this tremendous happening which is freely mentioned elsewhere? To this question no answer appears to be forthcoming. One interpretation coming from very early times is worthy of being recorded; it is to the effect that the silence symbolizes the beginning of eternal rest. This is interesting; but, as one of the leading modern expositors of the Apocalypse has pointed out, it is exegetically impossible; rest and silence, moreover, are by no means synonymous terms, and one can hardly symbolize the other. More might be said, but the foregoing will suffice to indicate the variety of opinions which have been held, and to suggest that a really convincing interpretation is still to seek. To this quest we now address ourselves, as best we may.

Any attempt to explain the silence is, of necessity, conditioned by the view taken of the symbolism of the Sealed Book, the opening of which is not merely its antecedent, but its cause. As I have already, elsewhere,¹ stated my own view of the matter, it will suffice here to indicate, in brief outline, the line of interpretation which commends itself as at once straightforward and suggestive. In vision we look upon the glory of God. Seated upon His throne He holds in His hand a Book, or Roll, sealed

fast with seven seals. This Book is seen to be full of writing, intelligible enough no doubt, but unreadable by reason of the seals that are upon it—an apt symbol of a thought in the mind of the Eternal Father which, for the time being, is utterly beyond the comprehension of His human children. This thought can be hardly other than the Divine purpose which, from all eternity present in the mind of God, is the true explanation of the creation of the world, and will find full realization in the final destiny of mankind. In a word, it is the final cause of the creation of the world, and of the course of world-history. Alike in the first century and in the twentieth the problems of Providence are passing strange, defying solution. But the writing is fair written, though man may not read it under present conditions; in other words, there is a hidden plan at the back of things, though to our dim sight they often enough seem to go strangely awry. None the less the golden thread of a high and holy purpose runs right through the tangled skein, and man will not remain in ignorance for ever. At the appointed time the seals will be broken, and the why and the wherefore of all things be made clear, utterly justifying God's ways to man. Knowing this, we may well possess our souls in patience, though for the present the seals still hold the secret of the Book. The hour of revelation has not yet struck.

Sealed fast with seven seals impressed along the edge of its overlying lip the Book remains closed until the last seal is broken. The unsealing, be it observed, is not an action, but a series of actions; the Book is not ripped open with one quick movement, the seals are broken one by one with slow deliberation; God is never in haste. In plain language, through the slow processes of history, with all its vicissitudes, its light and shade, its periods of apparent retrocession, the Divine thought is realizing itself in the world of fact, and the Divine plan irresistibly working itself out. The visions which appear as the seals are broken one by one form no part of the contents of the Roll, which remains inaccessible until the end. They are to be understood rather as accompaniments of the unhasting progress which is leading step by step to the final consummation of all things. In the language of common life, they may perhaps best be interpreted as symbolizing certain permanent features of human history¹ as it reveals itself in its untiring onward march to its divinely appointed goal.

¹ *Expositor*, Aug. 1920, 'The Mystery of the Sealed Book.'

¹ For the working out of this point the reader may be referred to the *Expositor* article mentioned in a previous note.

With the breaking of the sixth seal the end draws on apace. The Roll still holds its secret, but it hangs loose; and the moment of revelation draws nigh.

It is the greatest moment that has been since the world began, and the scene is drawn with tremendous dramatic power. Even we, who gaze from afar, are rapt out of ourselves and carried away as we behold in vision the blazing splendour of the Everlasting Throne, splendour which itself grows pale before the surpassing glory of the Enthroned. Before the throne rises the hallelujah song of the redeemed. Ever swelling in intensity and rapture, like the incoming sea beating against some granite cliff, wave after wave of triumphant praise beats around the foot of the throne, a swirling tempest of exultant joy. The hour strikes! the most momentous that earth or heaven has ever known—the Roll of Destiny is open now, the secret of the ages a secret no longer, the final cause of world-history has been made manifest, and His creatures are at last and for ever made sharers in the deepest thought of the Creator. The song sinks into silence, the storm of praise is stilled, and the voice of thanksgiving is dumb.

What does it mean? This strange hushing of the voice of praise in the moment of its fullest expression—how is it to be accounted for? The reader who has entered into the spirit of the vision, to whom it is no mere picture but, in some sort, a personal experience, will feel that the explanations already adduced are cold and thin, and all inadequate to meet the actualities of the case. If, for instance, the opening of the Roll symbolizes the revelation of the Eternal purpose which is working out its own accomplishment through the vicissitudes of life and experience, the final cause of history, and is therefore the ultimate justification of God's way to man, it must give certitude to the last degree. The silence with which it is greeted can hardly be explained as due to 'wistful or alarmed uncertainty.' It is rather due to rapturous amaze.

As we, ourselves in the grip of the current, contemplate the stream of history, flowing from some dim source, of which we know little more than nothing, to some mysterious goal of which we know nothing at all, its course presents a problem beyond our power of analysis. Its slow progress, its appalling set-backs, its apparently needless suffering, the

manifest disproportion between fortune and desert, the tolerance of successful vice, may well try to the utmost our belief in the existence of a controller of all things who is utterly wise and entirely good. This vision affords a triumphant answer to these baffling questions; it does not indeed satisfy our curiosity, but it does suffice to remove our doubts. For the Roll that is written but cannot at present be read tells us, in symbol, that behind things, of which we only see the outer side but not the inner meaning, a wise hand directs their movement, and through the tangled skein of human life the golden thread of a Divine purpose runs—a purpose which at the fitting time shall be made known.

In this sublime vision that supreme moment is pictured to the eye of faith. All perplexities are resolved, all hard questions answered at once and for ever, the heart of the Eternal is laid bare, and the result is—silence! A strange sequel and yet, in truth, significant enough. Silence speaks, and with no uncertain voice attests that, whatever the appearance of things in process, when the real meaning of history becomes manifest, the Divine purpose will shine forth clear and bright, infinitely wise and utterly good, completely transcending anything that man or angel ever dreamed. So overwhelmingly wonderful is the message of the Unsealed Book that, alike to the host of heaven and the redeemed from earth, no strength is left for song, they can only gaze in the silence of enraptured adoration.

Often under the frown of power, more often at the mercy of the mob, God seeming to sit silent and inert the while, the Seer and those to whom he addressed himself were beset with many hard questions. To these questions this splendid vision affords sufficient answer. As in the first century, so we of the twentieth are faced with problems of Providence beyond our solution, and questions the answer to which we cannot even guess. But the Book is written, and the Divine purpose, wise and good beyond our loftiest imaginings, is slowly realizing itself. God is in history to-day, though at times it is hard to discern His presence. Let us, for our comfort, accept this as an article of faith while the seals abide; and when the last seal is broken, and faith is lost in sight, in the silence of adoring wonder we shall experience our initiation into the Secret of the Ages as we look into the heart of God.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The 'Yo-Yo.'

BY THE REVEREND S. GREER, M.A., AYR.

'It will return upon him.'—Pr 26²⁷.

HAVE you got one—a yo-yo, I mean? Some little folk whom I know can think of nothing else. They practise with it every waking moment, and every day they are making new records. How many can you go up to? He's a friendly little fellow, the yo-yo, in his motley colours, spinning lightly from you, then leaping back to your hand!

All our lives we'll be playing yo-yo; not with the same toy, of course. But often the things we do come speeding back to us, as though they belonged to us, and claimed us. Do you know, for example, how they catch the Himalayan bear? It is by a kind of yo-yo. The sly natives of India have noticed what a bad temper he has, and have contrived a trap to catch him by means of it. They select a tree with a suitable horizontal bough, and on this they fasten a bait. Then from a branch overhead they suspend a big stone, in such a position that the bear must come against it to get at the food. The bear climbs the tree, walks along the bough, notices the obstacle and angrily pushes it aside. The stone swings away, but swings back, and hits the bear. With a growl of irritation he thrusts it aside more violently; the stone comes back with a tremendous whack on the bear's ribs. Perfectly mad with rage the obstinate creature gives one ferocious lunge, and sends the stone hurtling out in a wider circle than ever; back it comes with such terrific force that poor Bruin is knocked off the bough of the tree, at the foot of which the natives are waiting to throw a net over him.

You see, he really knocked himself off the tree. That bad temper of his came back (like the yo-yo), and was his undoing. When I first heard of his sad story, I couldn't help thinking about some people whom I know—do you?

It is a good rule never to hit things, *unless they begin it!* When your shoe-lace breaks, just because you're in an awful hurry to get out, don't throw your shoes about, or your lesson-book either when your sums won't come right, or your pen when the nib scratches. Don't fight with things you can't hurt; you only get hurt yourself. Those innocent-looking things you quarrelled with seem

to be lying quiet where they fell. It is all their pretence! They really aren't so harmless. They come springing back, and leave an ugly mark on your character. Temper delivers us into the hands of the enemy of our souls. It strikes back—as the Bible says, 'it will return upon you'—and injures your mind, and spoils your life.

How nimbly the yo-yo springs to your hand again! Just as surely do our acts and words return to us. Do a kindness, send out a smile, say a cheery word, and watch how they leap back at you from other people. You'll meet ever so many jolly folk if you spread jollity around. That was what a great writer meant when he said that 'the world is a mirror, and gives us back the reflection of our own faces.' Friendliness is catching; kindness is infectious. They will return upon you. Here's a yo-yo to practise with every day!

The Flint Purse.

BY THE REVEREND E. A. ANTHONY, M.A., TROWBRIDGE.

'Treasure hid.'—Mt 13⁴⁴.

One day a year or two ago, a boy was out with a shooting party on Salisbury Plain. His father had brought him along to help carry the luncheon and the game that would be shot. At midday the shooting party settled down for a meal and a rest. After they had eaten their sandwiches they sat there talking about the sport they had had. But the boy did not sit down after he had eaten the food which had been given him. It is only grown-up people who sit still after a meal. When you have had a meal you want to be up and off, and doing something, don't you? So the boy began to wander about. There were flint stones lying everywhere on the short turf of the plain. This boy began to do what perhaps you have done. I know I often did it on the Sussex Downs when I was a boy. He picked up a big flint and threw it down as hard as he could on another flint. If you hit the right place, the flint will split into pieces. To see something smash up rather pleases a boy. Well, this boy broke up several flints and then he found quite a big one. It would make a glorious smash. So he lifted it up. One, two, three, SMASH! And then a wonderful thing happened. Out of that broken flint there poured more than

fifty gold coins. For that big flint was what is called a 'flint purse.' Some had been found on the Plain before. Long, long before Julius Cæsar came to Britain, some dweller on the plain found a hollow flint. He put his money into it and carefully stopped up the hole with a plug of clay. In fact he made a savings bank of it. What happened to it afterwards I cannot tell you. How he lost it we can never know. But there it was with the coins safely inside it, having waited for two thousand years for that lucky boy to pick it up. The coins were gold, but very poor gold, mixed with a lot of other metal. They were very rough copies of an old Greek coin of Philip of Macedonia, the father of Alexander the Great. That coin was a beautiful one, bearing the figure of a four-horsed chariot. It was much admired and it was copied again and again. These copies can be traced westward all across Europe, but like most copies they became worse and worse until the beautiful design became a kind of scrawl. Only a man who knew the history of coins would have been able to see in those gold coins in the flint purse a poor imitation of a beautiful Greek coin.

Now, when treasure is found in England, there is an old law that orders an inquest, that is, an inquiry, to be held. So the coroner, who holds an inquiry when some one is killed in an accident, held an inquest on those coins. The jury decided that they were 'Treasure Trove,' that is, treasure found, and that they belonged to the Crown. So the coins were sent to London and were sold. The British Museum got some, and some of the best were brought to the Salisbury Museum. And what about the boy who found them? He was given fifty pounds, and a savings-bank account was opened for him with the money. I expect he will smash every likely looking flint that he comes across, but he will never find another one full of gold coins.

Isn't it interesting to think how often old coins are found when old houses are being pulled down or deep foundations dug? You see, in those far away days there were no banks to take care of people's savings. So people hid their savings in their houses, under the floors, or they dug a hole in the ground and buried them. Then perhaps something happened to them; they had to leave their homes suddenly or they were killed, and no one knew where their money had been hidden. When that man who put his coins into the flint purse died, I expect people looked everywhere for his treasure. 'Whatever did he do with it?' they said. 'I know he had a lot of gold coins,' said

another, 'he must have hidden them somewhere.' They looked and searched and dug, but they never found them. At last, more than two thousand years later, that lucky boy came along and found them.

I think Jesus must have heard of a story something like this. It was very common for treasure to be buried in His day. Perhaps He had seen some man or boy rejoicing because he had dug up or found hidden treasure. For in a little parable He spoke about the joy of finding hidden treasure, and said His Kingdom was like that treasure, bringing joy to the person who found it. What He meant was this, I think—to find that Jesus is our Friend who will help us and guide us must make us glad. A follower of the Lord Jesus ought to be a happy person. For he has found the best of all precious things.

The Christian Year.

SUNDAY NEXT BEFORE ADVENT.

The Helpful Trend of Modern Science towards Religion.

I. GOD AND HIS UNIVERSE.

BY THE REVEREND P. N. BUSHILL, B.A., ORPINGTON.

'Go through, go through the gates; prepare ye the way of the people; cast up, cast up the highway; gather out the stones; lift up a standard for the people.'—Is 62¹⁰.

The prophet is calling upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem to prepare the way for the return of the Exiles from Babylon. The long days of exile are now over: the day of return has come. Let the people make preparations: let them remove the many stumbling-blocks, cast out the stones, and make a highway for the return. A glad work was that! And a wonderful picture of the work which our Lord Jesus Christ was going to do—for did He not use words from the sixty-first chapter as the basis of His gospel and work?

Is there not a need for this message to-day? Do we not find a parallel at the present time? It is not the business of the Church to teach Science—or to refute it: our province is elsewhere. But it is the business of the Church to preach the gospel of deliverance to the captives, and to remove out of the way all stones and stumbling-blocks against their return. Science has indeed been the Nebuchadnezzar who has carried many away captive, but science to-day, it would seem, is being used by God as His servant Cyrus, to bring about the return of His exiles. Science to-day gives us a conception of the universe in which it is natural

to believe in God—in fact, one may say that it is almost scientific to believe in the foundation principles of the Bible. 'As expounded by scientists like Eddington, it looks as though the new knowledge will help rather than hinder faith in the Gospel of Jesus Christ,' says F. C. Bryan, in a very helpful little book, 'The New Knowledge and the Old Gospel.' The Bishops attending the last Lambeth Conference write: 'There is much in the scientific and philosophical thinking of our time which provides a climate more favourable to faith in God than has existed for generations.' Therefore let us not be silent. In the last generation the Church was not slow to express its fears at the findings of science, at the conclusions of materialism and evolution: let us not be silent when science stands on our side! Now in what way is science helpful to, rather than a hindrance to, faith in the gospel of Jesus Christ?

1. *Modern Science supports a Spiritual Interpretation of the Universe.*—Right up to the end of last century the age of materialism in science reigned: everything was based upon the ultimate material atom, hard and bullet-like, which was at the back of everything we could see or touch. The universe was like a great machine, and 'Lord Kelvin confessed that he could understand nothing of which he could not make a mechanical model' (Sir James Jeans, *The Mysterious Universe*, p. 17). But to-day all this has been changed. Professor Eddington thus talks (Bryan, p. 25): 'The solid substance of things is an illusion. It is a fancy projected by the mind into the external world. We have chased the solid substance from the continuous liquid to the atom, from the atom to the electron, and there we have lost it. The stuff of this world is not matter, it is mind stuff.' Sir James Jeans at Cambridge, 4th November 1930, said: 'To-day there is a wide measure of agreement, which on the physical side of science approaches almost to unanimity, that the stream of knowledge is heading toward non-mechanical reality. The universe begins to look more like a great thought, than like a great machine.' Sir Oliver Lodge gives his opinion: 'We have concentrated too much upon matter. . . . The real fact is that we are in the midst of a spiritual world, that it dominates the material.' Quotations such as these show us that the old materialism, which was such a barrier to some would-be believers in God, has gone, gone entirely, not to return: whatever explanation of the universe must ultimately be accepted, it is certain that it must be on spiritual lines. 'The things which are seen are temporal,

and the things which are not seen are eternal.' This modern view of the universe does not, of course, prove the existence of God, but such a belief is certainly congruous with it.

2. *Modern Science believes in a Creation of the World.*—Einstein holds that the world is definitely finite—terribly immense, inconceivably great, yet finite none the less. He declares: 'the present matter of the universe cannot have existed for ever. . . . We are led to contemplate an event or continuous process of creation at some time not infinitely remote. In some way, matter which had not previously existed, came or was brought into being.' He describes how millions of years ago the stars and the sun came into existence: then, how our earth was flung off as a globe of gas intensely hot from the sun, upon which, as it cooled, land and sea, and finally life appeared. Jeans suggests that if we want a picture of that creation we may think of 'the finger of God agitating the ether.' But Gn 1¹ gives us a more beautiful picture—and, this is the important point, one which scientifically can be held to-day: 'In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.' A creation certainly implies a Creator: and while science cannot identify that Creator with God, yet there is much in the modern scientific view that is in harmony with our conception of God. Jeans (p. 89) sums up his theory of the Creation in these telling words: 'These concepts reduce the whole universe to a world of light, potential or existent, so that the whole story of its creation can be told with perfect accuracy, and completeness, in the six words, 'God said, Let there be light.'

3. *Modern Science also believes that the World will have an End.*—Jeans states (p. 75): 'Most men find the final dissolution of the universe as distasteful a thought as the dissolution of their own personality. . . . but ' . . . for ever solid matter melts into insubstantial radiation: for ever the tangible changes into the intangible.' Radiant energy is becoming less and less. Sooner or later 'the sun and the stars will have annihilated all their radio-active matter, and will have burned themselves out as it were in fervent heat, and all their energy will have been dissipated in the vast emptiness of space.' Is not this another way of describing what is called the 'Day of the Lord' in 2 P 3¹⁰? 'But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements

shall melt with fervent heat, the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.' Jeans further says that some scientists hold that the radiation which is thus continually being set free may be re-consolidating itself again into matter: 'a new heaven and a new earth, they suggest, may be in process of being built'—a very interesting phrase which again brings us back to our Bible.

4. *Science to-day allows more room for God in the Universe.*—The older physics which held sway from the seventeenth century right up to the end of the nineteenth century, on account of its servitude to the theory of mechanical cause and effect, really allowed no room for God. It was deterministic. Everything had to follow certain laws. 'Miracles do not happen' was the unhesitating proclamation of science. Now Professor Eddington shows us that the laws which were thought to be causal are found on investigation to be statistical: e.g. insurance societies can predict the percentage of people who will die at a certain age, but this does not say who will die at that age. They state the way deaths are observed to occur, not the way they *have* to occur. There something enters in which science cannot explain. Jeans puts it another way: he says that if two thousand atoms of radium were in a room, science can tell us that probably within a year one atom will disappear, that is, break up into its constituent parts; but as to how that particular atom is selected, and the other one thousand nine hundred and ninety-nine are left, science can say nothing. He says, 'fate comes and knocks at the door.' 'There may be some factor for which we have so far found no better name than fate, operating in nature to neutralize the cast-iron inevitability of the old law of causation.' But what if that unknown factor be God? There is now no scientific reason for bowing God out of His universe. Jeans sums it up (p. 29): 'the picture of the universe presented by the new physics contains more room than did the old mechanical picture for life and consciousness to exist within the picture itself, together with the attributes which we commonly associate with them, such as free-will, and the capacity to make the universe in some small degree different by our presence.'

5. *Finally, we see Science in a more humble mood than formerly.*—Scientists are not nearly so dogmatic as they used to be. They know so much that they realize how little they know. At any rate they are coming to conclusions which the Bible, through the leap of faith, came to years and

years ago. Jeans in talking of the problem of determinacy, and cognate problems, says (p. 29), 'We still have no definite knowledge of these problems.' Physicists to-day are working with two different theories of light, which are mutually incompatible. Lord Balfour says, 'The contradictions of theology are not more striking than the contradictions of science.' Professor Whitehead exclaims, 'Heaven knows what seeming nonsense may not to-morrow be demonstrated truth.' Again, the Bible, 'Now we see through a glass darkly.'

And to what conclusion do we come? With this chastened mood of the scientist, together with his pronounced emphasis on the spiritual interpretation of the universe, we may thank God for the stones which are being taken out of the way of the would-be believer in Jesus Christ. The universe does in any case hold out a riddle for everybody. Dr. Cairns (*The Reasonableness of the Christian Faith*, p. 8) has reminded us that 'Christianity professes to be a solution of that riddle. By abandoning it we do not therefore get rid of mystery and difficulty, but we greatly accentuate them.' H. G. Wells and Julian Huxley are entitled to have their own views, and they may say that they have scientific backing for them: but the important thing for us to note is that we also are entitled to have our own, and—this is important—science to-day not only lays no stumbling-block in the way of faith, but rather helps and encourages it. F. C. Bryan closes his useful little book with this sentence: 'The way is still open to any man to believe in Christ, if he will; if he will not, it is not science that forbids.'

FIRST SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Messenger and his Message.

'How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings, that publisheth peace; that bringeth good tidings of good, that publisheth salvation; that saith unto Zion, Thy God reigneth.'—Is 52'.

What lies behind these words is an imagination of Zion, once a queen envied and magnificent, but now a ruined, childless city, gazing with patient hopelessness along the road by which her sons were led away.

Jerusalem is set about with hills, and on their edge the sentinels had often seen against the sky the spears and banners of invaders; but one day—and the heart thrills at the thought of it—one day the weary Zion shall see upon these mountains a

courier, running like one who has great news to bring.

Paul, for whom everything connected with his ministry had the colour of romance, caught at this phrase as descriptive of the Christian preacher. Sorrowfully it has to be confessed that, both for speaker and hearer, preaching has often been a prosaic matter of official duty and outward form; but all the more do we turn to the ideal of it, where eagerness is seen on both sides because of the greatness of the theme.

1. What meets us first in the words is *an imagination of the hearer*. We are a race who wait; for the earth, with all its bounty, cannot hide from us the sense of something which has not come. The world is rich in kindness and in interest. We know the zest of work, we rejoice in the goodness of friendship, but not less do we find on everything some touch of elusiveness, as if it did not give us all that it promised. Men are not to be taken too seriously in the account which they give of themselves; for, behind the show of contentment with life as it is and their preoccupation with work and society, there is something else which, in hours of naked feeling, is betrayed. There are longings in men of which they themselves are unaware, but at a word they leap into clearness. Men do in the depths believe in God; and though His word has not yet found them, they believe that it will come and will be good. And that is what makes preaching hopeful; for the men whom God has made are waiting.

2. But next, in these lines we have *an imagination of the preacher*; and the figure needs little explanation which discovers the peculiar beauty of the messenger in his feet. Other qualities a preacher may have, but in the eyes of needy men, this is first—that he hastens. He comes as one who has something to say which his fellows will be glad to hear, and he is content that other gifts and commendations should be forgotten in that. 'It is required of a servant,' says Paul, 'that he be found faithful'; and the preacher's first business is to see that he does not interpose anything of his own between his hearers and the good news which he has brought. As Dr. Denney says, he is not a diplomatist, free by negotiation to secure as much as he can of his proposals, but a herald; his business is not even to prove but to proclaim the gospel.

That does not, in the least, mean that preaching is to be impersonal, a lesson taken over from another and repeated without any personal impress. Paul often speaks of 'my gospel,' by which he

meant the good news as the peculiarity of his experience had enabled him to see it; it is what Jesus Christ meant in particular to him. What gives vital energy to preaching, and gives it power and impact, is that the word should have a life behind it, that the gospel should have taken shape anew in the heart and thought of a believing man.

The preacher is set between two constraints which may seem to impel him in opposite directions. He has to come down to the ignorance and slowness of men, he must try to see inside their minds and talk in their many dialects. He may have to keep something in reserve, making use of half words until he is free to use whole words; and in all this he is following the example of his Lord. He must become all things to all men, although in so doing the temptation waits for him of meeting men half-way, and modifying the message which he bears.

But there is another constraint, which comes in to keep him right. 'How shall they preach,' says Paul, 'except they be sent?' They are sent; their business is Christ's business, and success crowns them when Christ and men are face to face. If we know what salvation is and what human sorrow is, we shall always find pleasure in the thought of the wideness of the proclamation. Much preaching, it is true, aims at nothing and achieves nothing; but in every kingdom under heaven to-day tired souls are being cheered by gifts and messages from the Son of man. And wherever He speaks, impossible things are done: comforts arise in the midst of distress, order and quietness come into the life of hurry, and men grown hopeless are cheered by the assurance of redemption. Hearts grow simple, evil men get clean desires, selfish girls come to know the dignity and sacredness of life; these are the works of Jesus by His words. And it is because of them that men have revered the office of the messenger.

3. Finally, the text offers a suggestion as to *the character of the gospel*. 'Many things are true and, on occasion, salutary and important, which are not, in strictness, gospel.' One great mission preacher says: 'I remember how my heart grew hot as one speaker after another stood up and spoke about the wages of sin and the like, but I heard no gospel preached. These stern truths were not to be forgotten, but other things needed to be said first.' The very word 'gospel'—good tidings—suggests the need of variety in presentation, for the conditions of life may have driven men into an attitude in which what is good tidings

for others may seem too light and sanguine for them. Here, in the poet's mind, is the image of this despairing, forsaken city—what kind of word does she need to raise up her heart and make the world about her new? Here are men whose life is spoiled because their hearts are sullied and they cannot recover cleanness, what word can change their mood? Here are women whose days are one long ache, what word can give them light enduring? A gospel must be judged by the situation, and if the trouble is deep it must be deeper yet. It must be *good* news to make the mourner sing for joy, and it must be *good news* that does not affront the ancient troubles of the heart by the sense that it has been heard before. That is everywhere the character of the gospel; and in our hard age it is very needful that men should labour to secure in preaching 'a strong infusion of those elements which make a gospel.'

The prophet fancied that the best news which he could bring to troubled men was the assurance that 'God is King.' He uses other words—it is good tidings of good, of peace, of salvation, but what these all lead up to, and where they leave the mind is this—thy God is King. It had seemed as if God had withdrawn Himself from Israel and from the world, and life was left without a plan; neither from the fortunes of their nation nor from their lot as individual men and women could they gather the assurance that He cared. They knew that they had sinned with their fathers, but it seemed as if on them had come the gathered burden of that ill desert. It was an age of good intentions. They meant to do well, and looked back with abhorrence on the excesses of Manasseh's time, but it made no difference. They were left to themselves.

But now, in a single incident, there came the assurance for which they had waited; it was a bare fact in history, a change in imperial policy towards a subject race. The king of the East, who had held the people captive, was now to let them go. A bare event!—Yes, but in that event they caught a sight of God, which made the whole world new.

In what is essential, men of to-day are near of kin to those of Zedekiah's age. There is among them little actual aversion from good, and there is a great deal of a sort of helpless good intention. People mean to be kind and honest and clean, but their intentions do not always find effect. They blunder, and the blunder remains; they lose their freshness and cannot recover it. And troubles come, bitter and blinding. Friends talk to them

in ways of consolation, but it is all words, for when they stretch out their hands in the dark no hand grasps theirs. What they need above all else is the assurance, coming home to them with unchallengeable force, that God is alive and King.

It often seems as if He did not care for our good intentions, but here we find the measure of His concern; 'God *so* loved the world,' it is written. And hearts that have drowsed and grumbled—conscious of fault but finding no escape from it—have started broad awake at the witness of this fact, and have left their sin behind; and men grown spiritless because no one cared have kindled up their courage, and gone to be the messengers of hope to others, because of this living love of God. There is no true preaching except that which Paul has named 'the word of the Cross,' for in it men gain assurance as to what is in the mind of God. And it is God we need to meet; not Jesus of Nazareth, a gracious and winning figure in history, but the very God in whose hands our life is. We need to see clearly not in the pleasant fields of Galilee, but in our perplexed life to-day. Peter, that great lover of Jesus, yet says of his Master—'Through whom ye do believe in God, who raised him from the dead and gave him glory, that your faith and hope might be in God.' It is God we need to come at, to know that God is King. Nothing makes the world new for a man like the assurance that God sees, and God cares, and God controls. That is to get back the face of God again.

And so the world of men has been cheered in age after age by the tidings borne across the centuries of this tremendous incident, in which all of God, the Unchanging, is revealed. When rightly told, it is ever a word of good news; and in all ages no spectacle has appeared to troubled men more welcome than the messenger who tells of Jesus Christ.¹

SECOND SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Christ of the New Testament and the Christ of To-day.

'Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day, yea and for ever.'—Heb 13⁸ (R.V.).

This letter was probably written between A.D. 80–90, though it may have been as early as A.D. 65. Anyhow, they were second-generation Christians to whom this letter was addressed. If the writer was Apollos—and that is the most plausible guess—he also was a second-generation

¹ W. M. Macgregor, *Jesus Christ the Son of God*, 3.

Christian. So far as His human history went, Jesus belonged to the world's yesterday. But what Apollon says here is that Jesus was the same to him, and the Christians to whom he was writing, as He had been to the apostles and those who first believed. Then the writer waxes very bold and says that not only second-generation Christians but all succeeding generations would find Jesus to be in experience what the Christians of the New Testament had found Him to be.

The prevailing tendency amongst those who have written about the Person of Jesus has been to try to bring Him within the ordinary human categories—to eliminate the supernatural from His story and to deny the Divine in His nature. They tell us that what we have in the Gospels is an idealized picture, and that if we want to get at the real Jesus we must strip His story of the legends with which His imaginative disciples have embellished it. It is true that these critics do not agree among themselves as to what incidents are to be regarded as legendary, and it is also true that recent developments in philosophy and science have made some of their objections to the miraculous element in the Gospels look ridiculous. There is a process going on in literary biography just now, the aim of which seems to be to show us that our heroes were not heroes at all. The Americans call the process 'debunking.' The writers of this particular style of biography set out to prove that the men we regarded as great, and at whose shrines we worshipped, were very common clay after all. Lytton Strachey, perhaps, set the fashion in England—Queen Victoria, Cardinal Manning, General Gordon, all suffered at his hands. In America the process has been carried further—Abraham Lincoln, Henry Ward Beecher, D. L. Moody, have all been shown up as very ordinary mortals. And beginning with Strauss, there has been a similar process at work upon the picture of Jesus given us in the New Testament. Starting from the position that miracles cannot happen, writers have given us a picture of Jesus from which every bit of the supernatural has been eliminated. The general result of their work is to leave us with a Jesus who was a Prophet, a Teacher, a Moralist (of whose moral teaching the late Mr. Arnold Bennett was pleased to approve)—a figure with a certain pathetic charm, but not the mighty Christ of the New Testament. All ideas of Incarnation, Atonement, Resurrection vanish from His story.

1. But this 'reduced' Jesus is not the Jesus Christ of historic Christianity. He is an invention

of these later years. 'The gospel,' says Mr. John Whale, 'gathers about three moments—the Son of God Incarnate, Crucified, Risen.' 'I have come to realize clearly,' he adds, 'that when I cannot preach the Incarnation, the Crucifixion, the Resurrection, I shall have *ipso facto* given up proclaiming the gospel of the blessed God and might as well take up gardening.' Let those who incline to this 'reduced' Jesus at least recognize what they are doing—they are giving up the gospel and cutting themselves adrift from that Christianity which has two thousand years of history behind it.

2. In the second place, this cult of the 'reduced' Jesus is not only a departure from historic Christianity, but it leaves that historic Christianity, and the Church which has preached it, entirely unaccounted for. If one thing is certain it is this: such a Jesus as has been presented to us of late would never have brought the Church into being. It was the Resurrection that made the Church.

3. And thirdly, with this 'reduced' Jesus, Christianity ceases to be a redemptive religion. It ceases, indeed, to be a religion at all and becomes a morality. And there is no regenerating power in morality.

But what if the 'reduced' Jesus is the real Jesus? Whatever cherished beliefs may have to be sacrificed, we must have the truth at all costs. We dare not bolster up our faith with lies. And that brings us to the really crucial question: Which is the *real* Jesus—the great Jesus of the New Testament, or the 'reduced' Jesus offered to us in these latter days?

Of course there is no doubt at all about the New Testament view of Jesus. This is how Dr. Denney puts it: 'To the apostles and early Christians, Christ is the Prince of Life, Lord of all, Judge of the living and the dead, at God's right hand, the Giver of the Spirit, the Fulfiller of all the promises of God. He is not the first of Christians or the best of men, but something absolutely different from this. The apostles and their converts are not persons who share the faith of Jesus; they are persons who have Jesus as the object of their faith and who believe in God through Him.' Dr. Denney has not overstated the case. That is the picture we get in the New Testament. But that suggests another question: How came the apostles and the early Christians to form so exalted a conception of Christ and to think of Him as Divine? There was no doctrine the apostles and early Christians were less likely to invent than the doctrine of the Divinity of our Lord. For the

Jews were strict monotheists. Inveterate prejudices had to be overcome before these men could bring themselves to attribute Divinity to Jesus. But here is the plain, undeniable fact: that, within thirty years of the death of Jesus, the Apostle Paul (a Hebrew of Hebrews) could rank Jesus with God and the Holy Spirit in the same formula, 'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost be with you all.' The question is: How came the early Christians to give such a supreme place to Jesus? And the answer is, their experience of Him gave them no option. Their doctrine of Christ is the result of their experience of Christ. They believed Him to be God because He had worked the works of God in and upon them.

Now, if the experiences of the early Christians stood alone and had not been repeated, they would not have helped us very much. Indeed, we might have been tempted to doubt their reality. But those experiences have been repeated all down the centuries and are being repeated still. The experience of Paul, for example, was repeated in the classic cases of Augustine and Luther and John Bunyan and John Wesley. In other words, Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day. He produces the same effect upon men. And our faith in His Divinity is not something imposed upon us by ecclesiastical authority; it is a faith to which we are driven by our own experience of the power and grace of Jesus. Let us mention three of these experiences. (1) First of all, upon us, as upon the people to whom He spoke in Galilee and Palestine, He casts the spell of His *authority*. He is the supreme Moral Master. He is unchallenged Sovereign in the realm of truth. Even those who repudiate His Divinity acknowledge His moral supremacy. Mr. Arnold Bennett would keep the Sermon on the Mount as embodying the highest ethical ideal. His words have the stamp of finality and truth about them, and the honest conscience bows to His authority. But how came He to possess this authority? How came Jesus of Nazareth to possess a moral wisdom to which no seer or sage, no prophet even of His own inspired race, can make any claim? There is really but one answer, 'God gave not the spirit by measure unto him.'

(2) Then, secondly, there is the experience of release, of the forgiveness of sins. Jesus does for men and women still what He did for Paul, what He did for Bunyan, what He did for Wesley—He releases men from the burden and fear of sin, He reconciles them to God. He gives them peace of

heart. He has done it for millions of folk. 'Who can forgive sins but God only?' asked the indignant Pharisees when Jesus said to the paralytic, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee.' Well, who can? But Jesus does actually forgive sin. He does still, in very deed, 'loose men from their sins.' There is a multitude which no man can number who have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb.

(3) And then, again, there is the experience of *empowerment*. He empowered men in the ancient days. He empowered Peter to conquer his fickleness, and John to conquer his fiery temper; He empowered the woman who was a sinner to conquer her lusts, and Zacchæus to conquer his avarice. And His power in this regard has not lessened one whit. He still looses the prisoner, and sets the captive free, and makes men able to stand in the evil day. He lifts men 'over self to reign as kings.' There is no need to quote classic cases like that of Alan Gardiner and his victory over his passions, and J. B. Gough and his victory over drink. We have probably the witness in ourselves. We know that we have never lost a fight when He has been with us. The redeeming and delivering Christ is not simply a picture in a book. He is a fact in innumerable lives.

It is not in the New Testament alone we discover the Divine Christ—we find Him in the present-day experience of Christian people. He accomplishes still the same wondrous deeds as He accomplished when He was here in bodily form. Jesus Christ is the same, yesterday and to-day. The Gospels, as Dr. T. R. Glover says, are not four, but ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, and the last word of every one of them is this: 'Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.' That is the only Christ equal to the task of the world's redemption. When we reduce Him to a human and fallible Jesus we really abandon all hope of the world's salvation, for we have no sure word about God, we have no sure word about the forgiveness without this. And we have no gospel for a sinful and unhappy world. We must be sure upon this one thing—we must know that the Son of God is come. That is the corner-stone of the Christian faith. But if we are sure *there*, we have a great gospel. And we may be sure by submitting our lives to His influence and opening our hearts to His incoming. That is the faith that is to overcome the world—the faith that Jesus is the Son of God.¹

¹ J. D. Jones, *Richmond Hill Sermons*, 40.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

The Finality of Christ's Ideal.

'Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?'—Mt 11³.

If the finality of Christ's morality is once admitted, it goes very far to justify the position which Christian dogma assigns to Christ—allowing for the fact that that position is expressed in the language of ancient metaphysics. For, in setting forth a moral ideal—in not only teaching it, but (as the conscience of humanity has felt) in realizing it in a supreme manner by His character and His life, Christ was not merely the Revealer of human duty. He was the Revealer of God's inmost nature. That is the very heart of all Christian doctrine, that the perfect moral ideal is a revelation of the moral character of God. If Christ remains for us the final Revealer of duty, He will remain to us the final Revealer of God.

And yet, of course, there are many to whom this idea of a final moral revelation is just the great stumbling-block. Minds possessed with the idea of evolution, whether in its philosophical or its scientific form, are disposed to lay it down *a priori* that the very idea of a final revelation is almost a contradiction in terms—that there can be no more finality about ethical ideals than there can be about philosophical or scientific theories or about political constitutions or the like. The very fact that Christ's teaching was adapted to the age in which it was delivered shows (they will say) that it was unadapted for so different an age as that in which we live.

Now, of course, there is a sense in which the objectors are perfectly right. No detailed system of precepts could be fit (if we may borrow a phrase from Kant) for universal legislation. The right course of conduct in detail necessarily depends upon circumstances. Circumstances are always changing, and the changes cannot be foreseen. It is only the most general moral principles that could conceivably be eternal. And in nothing is the greatness of Jesus more conspicuously exhibited than in the universality of His teaching. The very essence of the doctrine which He had to teach for His own age was the worthlessness—the comparative worthlessness, even when they were not actually pernicious—of the ritual sacrifices, the distinction between clean and unclean meats, the fastings, the vain repetitions in prayer, the Sabbatarian casuistry, above all the exclusive and anti-social laws of ceremonial purity, in which, according to the dominant Pharisaism, the essence

of religion consisted. Without saying that for Jews of His time and age some of these external rites might not be properly observed, as eternal laws of God He swept them all away. 'This he said, making all meats clean.' And He carefully abstained from setting up any other system of rites and ceremonies, any new hierarchy, any elaborate code even of moral precepts in their place. He confined Himself to teaching, and illustrating by parable and example and by application to temporary and immediate circumstance, a few very general and very fundamental principles. Nay more, He explicitly recognized the necessity of continual ever-fresh adaptations and applications of His principles to changing needs and circumstances. He taught that the revelation which God was making through Him would be carried on hereafter by the same Holy Spirit who spake in Him, working in the hearts of His followers. 'He shall take of mine, and show it unto you.'

Let us consider the kind of way in which a hearty belief in the finality of Christ's teaching and work may be combined with a full and frank recognition of the necessity for continuous growth and development in our ideal of human life.

And to do that, we must ask: 'What are the essential and eternal rules of conduct which Christ laid down?' Our Lord expressly taught that the law of love included all other commandments. Here we have the fundamental moral principle to which all previous higher teaching pointed, but which it never quite reached. It had been enunciated by the Buddhists but with a difference; for by the Buddhist philanthropy was recommended as a mode of asceticism, whereas to Christ asceticism (in the true sense) was merely a kind of philanthropy. It was for the sake of others that Christ recommended self-denial, not for its own sake. We can find Stoic precepts very like Christ's law of Brotherhood; but the pride and self-sufficiency which Stoicism encouraged showed that its principle was inadequately grasped. But however that may be—whatever be the exact degree of originality which we attribute to Christ's moral discovery—that principle of Brotherhood was the very essence of His teaching.

But this rule taken by itself is, it need hardly be said, an inadequate rule of life. Immoral paradox as it would have seemed to Aristotle or to Ezra, it is a rule which in later times has seldom been denied by any teacher or thinker who can be said really to have believed in morality at all. And yet many of those teachers have not taught in all its fullness and purity what we all recognize as the

Christian ideal. For what does loving one's neighbour mean? It means promoting whatever we regard as his true end, treating his true good as equally important with our own.

Now there are two ways in which this ideal must always be growing. In the first place, we are continually growing in our appreciation of the means by which the good of our neighbour is to be promoted. St. Paul saw at once that a slave should be treated as a brother beloved, but it was thirteen hundred years before Wycliffe for the first time drew the inference that in that case slavery must be absolutely and irredeemably immoral. It is only quite recently, again, that people have begun fully to realize that love to one's neighbour may express itself in the deliberate refusal to give him alms, or in fighting against low wages and insanitary habitations, as well as in relieving the sickness and misery which is their natural outcome. It is still more recently that they began to suspect the social ill-effects, and therefore the wickedness, of idleness and extravagance in people who have (as the phrase is) independent means. And secondly, there is a growth in man's conception of what the good is. This good of my neighbour which we ought to promote did not to Christ mean mere pleasure. That is just the difference between Christianity and mere Utilitarianism. We may say that at all times Christianity means the promotion of one's neighbour's truest and highest good, but when we come to ask what in detail that good is, what sort of things a Christian ought to be doing for his neighbour, it is obvious that for a modern Englishman it must mean many things which Christ could not possibly have anticipated.

And yet, we do find certain broad principles which must be recognized as no less eternal a part of Christianity than the rule itself. It is not merely because of its external effects that Christianity prescribes love to one's fellow-men. The love itself, the loving type of character is itself the best thing in human life, and therefore part of the good which we ought to promote for others as well as for ourselves. The ideal of Nietzsche could never be regarded as a legitimate development of the teaching of Christ, even though sophists should succeed in persuading us that economic or intellectual selfishness was in the long run the best way of promoting the true interests of human society.

And this type of character, which the Christian recognizes as his own true good, he must promote in others also. That is one reason why Christ put the law of love to God side by side with the love

of man. The two precepts properly understood coincide. For the true love of God is the desire to do His will, and Christ taught that God had no other will for His creatures than their own true good. On the other hand, the true love of one's brother is the desire that he should be all that God wills him to be. It is not our brother's mere comfort and convenience that Christ taught us to promote, but a certain ideal of character, an ideal kind of life. What is this kind of life? The most important element in it is just this unselfishness itself. But many different kinds of life might no doubt be equally unselfish: and to say in detail what more besides unselfishness the true life contains does no doubt belong to that side of Christian morality in which we must needs recognize the principle of development. But a few general characteristics of true life our Lord did lay down. He recognized absolute truthfulness and sincerity as a part of the ideal character: religious hypocrisy or formalism was the vice which, next to heartlessness and cruelty, He most strongly denounced. And then there is another great principle—the superiority of the spiritual to the fleshly. This principle He understood in no ascetic spirit. He shocked the religious world of His day by refusing to enjoin fasting, by allowing His disciples to break the Sabbath to satisfy hunger, and by dining with rich publicans. And one law there was that had no exception—purity before marriage, fidelity afterwards. Though the Judaism of His day did not positively forbid polygamy, and allowed much freedom of divorce, Christ proclaimed the ideal of monogamous marriage. He contented Himself with laying down an ideal: how it was to be applied in detail to the regulation of practical life was a question which He may well be thought to have left to the consciences of His followers.

And is not this fact that we can still look back upon the teaching of this one Teacher, upon Him alone in all human history, as the fullest expression and representative of the ideal which commands the homage of all that is best in the modern world—is not this a fact of tremendous significance, a fact not merely of ethical but of theological significance? For those who believe in God, in a God who is revealed by the moral ideal in man, one in whom that ideal was uniquely expressed, must surely be *the* Revealer. Can it be wrong to describe Him in such language as that of the Fourth Gospel or the Nicene Creed?

And yet the important thing for the conduct of each individual life is not the exact language in

which we express these truths, but the extent to which we practically take up that attitude towards Christ which they represent. The important thing for human life is that we should really feel towards God as Christ felt towards Him, feel towards our brethren as He felt towards them, love and serve

them as He loved and served them. In that practical following of Christ, and not in holding any propositions about His Person, however true they may be, lies that way of salvation which He came to bring into the world.¹

¹ H. Rashdall, *Principles and Precepts*, 248.

Jerome's Work on the Psalter.

BY THE REVEREND ALGERNON WARD, M.A., CHURCH LAWFORD, RUGBY.

OF the Psalter, Jerome made three versions: two were revisions, and the third was a version direct from the Hebrew.

About A.D. 382-383 (the exact date is uncertain) Pope Damasus (366-384) invited and commissioned Jerome to revise the Old Latin New Testament, on the basis of the Greek text. 'You urge me,' wrote Jerome (*Praef. in iv. Evang.*), 'to revise the Old Latin Version and, as it were, to sit in judgment on the copies of Scripture which are now scattered throughout the whole world; and, inasmuch as they differ from one another, you would have me decide which of them agree with the Greek original. . . . If we are to pin our faith to the Latin texts, it is for our opponents to tell us *which*: for there are almost as many forms of texts as there are copies.'

The first instalment of his undertaking consisted of those scriptures most used by the Church—the Gospels and the Psalter.

His first revision of the Old Latin Psalter was made at Rome, 383-384, and became known as the *Psalterium Romanum*, probably so named because it was for the use of the Roman Church. He revised the Old Latin, emending from the LXX where the sense demanded it. Copies of the Old Latin in Jerome's day were very faulty and called for revision.

The Old Latin Version, the earliest daughter of the LXX, arose about the middle of the second century A.D., probably in North Africa, though the provenance of this version is still *sub judice*. There was more than one Old Latin translation of the Psalms in North Africa, and an extensive revision of the Psalter took place in that country in the middle of the fourth century (Paul Capelle, *Le Texte du Psautier Latin en Afrique*, 1913). The Old Latin Version was imperfectly translated

from the LXX, and was marked by rudeness and simplicity and by a close or even slavish adherence to the original Greek, though occasionally paraphrastic. Only in passages of some importance did Jerome think himself entitled to introduce alterations. Very much was simply taken over without alteration. Small mistakes and inexactnesses remained uncorrected, in order that the familiar language should be left untouched, so far as possible. Jerome retained the principle underlying the Old Latin Version, viz. a word for word rendering and even a respect for the order of the words. These lines, upon which his first attempt was conducted, afterwards seemed to him too inadequate and rigid.

Extant fragments of the Old Latin Version of the Psalter are accessible in Codex *Veronensis*, at Verona (published by Bianchini in his *Vindiciae Canon. Script.*, Rome, 1740): in Codex *Sangermanensis* in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris (published by Sabatier in *Bibliorum . . . latinae Versiones*, tome ii. Paris, 1751).¹

It would be interesting to know what text of the LXX Psalter Jerome employed in correcting the Old Latin text. It is not improbable that it was the text then current in Constantinople, where he had just spent two years (380-382) as the disciple of Gregory of Nazianzus, 'praeceptor meus a quo Scripturas explanante didici.' This text was apparently the Lucian edition—an Antiochian rescension of the *κοινή*—in use in Northern Syria and in the Greek East. Antioch was 'the ecclesiastical parent of Constantinople,' and copies of the LXX in use in Antioch would naturally reach Constantinople. Its good readings are those of the

¹ Much more material has been discovered, and is being prepared under the auspices of the Munich Academy.

Old Latin. In his letter to Sunnias and Fretula (Ep. cvi. 2), Jerome writes: '[ἡ κοινὴ] . . . a plerisque nunc Λουκιανὸς dicitur.' The LXX text of the Psalms, though not equal to that of the Pentateuch, is one of the best translations of the Old Testament Hebrew. The translator had an excellent knowledge of Hebrew, and appreciated the fact that the Psalter was for use in public worship. The translation was made from the best MSS. accessible at the time, and gives evidence as to the Hebrew text of the early second century B.C., three centuries earlier than the text as fixed by the school of Jamnia, and twelve centuries earlier than the Massoretic Text as fixed by Ben Asher and preserved in the earliest Hebrew codices.

Jerome seems to have published no preface to the Roman Psalter. The text of this Psalter is said to be the text used by Gregory the Great: it is also very much like that employed by Niceta, missionary bishop of Remesiana in Dacia, in the early part of the fifth century. Niceta wrote *On the Good of Psalmody*, and to him is traced the *Te Deum*, verses 22 to 29 of which are psalm verses. Professor Burkitt says St. Benedict's Rule (c. A.D. 530) has a text almost half-way between that of the Roman Psalter and that of the Mozarabic Psalter. The latter is of the Roman type, with the double influence of the African text (*i.e.* the type of text quoted by Cyprian, A.D. 200–258) and the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* by Jerome, which was specially popular in Spain.

In this his first revision of the Psalter, Jerome used his pen with restraint. 'I revised the Psalter and corrected it in a great measure, though but cursorily, in accordance with the Septuagint Version.' He only corrected such passages as seemed to carry a different meaning, allowing the rest to remain.

Some Latin MSS. have Jerome's three Psalters or two of them, side by side, in parallel columns, *e.g.* a triple Psalter is found in *Bibl. Bodl.* Laud. 35, at Oxford (tenth century), and a double one (Gallican and Hebrew with notes of variants in Roman Psalter) in D (Add. 32124), a thirteenth-century MS. in the British Museum.

The Roman Psalter was received as a great improvement on the Old Latin Version, and was used in the Roman Church till the time of Pius v. (A.D. 1566), when the Gallican Psalter, Jerome's second revision, was ordered to be sung in the daily offices. But there were certain exceptions. The Roman Psalter is still retained at St. Peter's, Rome, at Milan, and was used till 1808 at St.

Mark's, Venice. It is also partly retained in the Roman Missal and in the Invitatory Psalm (95) of the Roman Breviary.¹

In 385 Jerome left Rome for Palestine, and eventually settled at Bethlehem, where he died in 420. Sulpitius Severus (*Dialog.* i. 9), a contemporary of Jerome, writes: 'I made for the town of Bethlehem . . . , I stayed with Hieronymus six months . . . he is always occupied in reading, always at his books with his whole heart: he takes no rest day or night; he is perpetually reading or writing something.' Jerome himself tells us that he suffered from pain in the eyes from too close an application to reading, and from a dearth of amanuenses, slender means frequently depriving him of that assistance. Here at Bethlehem was done a revision of the Old Testament from the LXX, and a retranslation of the Old Testament from the Hebrew. Probably all the canonical books were revised *iuxta LXX*, though only the Psalter and the Book of Job have come down to us. In writing to St. Augustine in 416 he complains that the greater part of this work had been stolen from him. He also wrote very numerous letters, a catalogue of ecclesiastical writers, many controversial books, commentaries, and books illustrative of the Bible.

Probably his first production at Bethlehem was the *Psalterium Gallicanum* in 387.

The *Psalterium Romanum* had been so rapidly multiplied and so carelessly copied, that its text was soon in as bad a state as that of the Old Latin — *tot exemplaria paene quot codices*. In a short time 'the old error prevailed over the new correction': 'Psalterium Romae dudum positum emendaram et iuxta LXX interpretes, licet cursim, magna illud ex parte correxeram. Quod quia rursum videtis, O Paula et Eustochium scriptorum vitio depravatum, plusque antiquum errorem quam novam emendationem valere' (*Praef. in libr. Psalmorum*). It was at the urgent request of Paula and Eustochium that Jerome commenced a new and more thorough revision.

This revision is not from the κοινή, but from the Hexaplaric text. In his letter to Sunnias and Fretula, written about 403, Jerome speaks of 'aliam Septuaginta interpretum quae in Ἑξαπλοῖς Codicibus reperitur, et a nobis in Latinum sermonem fideliter versa est, et Hierosolymae atque in Orientis ecclesiis decantatur' (Ep. cvi. 2).

Jerome could now consult at his leisure the

¹ This Psalter preserved the Old Latin rendering *Dominus regnavit a ligno* (Ps 96⁴⁰). This famous Christian gloss is not in the Gallican Psalter.

documents in the library of Pamphilus at Cæsarea, especially the great hexaplaric and tetraplaric MSS which Origen has compiled.

Scholars sometimes call this revision 'the Latin Hexaplaric Psalter.'

Jerome now makes use of Origen's critical signs. A passage between an *obelus* and two points signifies it was present in the LXX, but wanting in the Hebrew; and a passage between an *asteriscus* and two points signifies it was lacking in the LXX, and had been supplied not from the Hebrew but from the Greek version of Theodotion. These critical marks were, of course, omitted in copies meant for general use. This version was known as the *Gallican Version* because it first attained a wide popularity in Gaul, most probably through the influence of Gregory of Tours towards the end of the sixth century. More than one mediæval writer attributes its introduction into Gaul to the initiative of Pope Damasus, who, however, died some three years before it appeared. Probably the victorious career of the Vulgate is due to the fact that it was generally believed in early times to be a revision carried out by the most learned of the Western Fathers at the bidding of Pope Damasus.

The Gallican Psalter is by far the best known of Jerome's three Psalters. It ultimately supplanted the Roman Psalter, which is now used in only two or three churches, and it found its way into the Latin Bible, and thence into the printed Vulgate in 1456, where it still remains. Into Germany it was possibly introduced by St. Boniface in the first half of the eighth century.

Pope Pius v., who died in 1572, had ordered the Gallican Psalter to be sung in the daily offices of churches in Rome and Italy.

The Gallican Psalter is dominant to-day, and is used everywhere in Roman Catholic worship, except at Milan, Toledo, and St. Peter's, Rome.

Professor Burdett conjectures that the wide diffusion of the Gallican Psalter was connected with the diffusion of the New Hymnary which ousted the Old Benedictine Hymnary not long after Charlemagne's time (A.D. 742-814). Slowly the Gallican Psalter superseded the earlier one, and the change was brought about in England in the ninth or tenth century (Bäumer, *Geschichte des Breviers* (1895), p. 247), and in Rome not till the sixteenth century. The attitude of the Church towards a new version of the Scriptures was similar to that of a rigidly conservative Anglican towards the Revised Version of our English Bible.

The MSS. containing the Gallican Psalter are

the MSS. of the Vulgate Old Testament, because this version of the Psalter established itself in the Church Bible. Codex Cavensis (ninth century) has the Gallican Psalter (with numerous Old Latin marginal variants) in the context of Old Testament books, *i.e.* between Job and Proverbs, while Jerome's Psalter translated from the Hebrew occurs (incomplete) at the end of the Apocalypse. Later MSS. frequently have the three Psalters, or two of them, side by side, in parallel columns. This Psalter is essentially the text of *Exemplar Parisiense*, approved by the University of Paris in the thirteenth century.

Some copies of the Gallican Psalter contain the *ψαλμός ιδιογραφος* added by the LXX, *i.e.* Ps 151, 'though it is outside the number (composed by David), when he fought in single combat with Goliath.'

V.²⁷ of Ps 136 in the Prayer Book Version—a repetition of v.³—is not found in the Hebrew or in any MS. of the LXX, nor is it in Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter. It is from the Gallican Psalter alone.

Professor Swete wrote: 'the liturgical Psalter of the Anglican Church "followeth . . . the translation of the great English Bible, set forth and used in the time of Henry the Eighth, and Edward the Sixth"; *i.e.* it is based on Coverdale's Version, which was "translated out of the Douche and Latyn into Englishe"; and many of its peculiarities may be traced to the LXX through the Gallican Psalter incorporated in the Vulgate.'

Coverdale got no help from Tyndale in his version of the Psalms, and, broadly stated, the Prayer Book Version is the work of Coverdale alone. Coverdale's English was excellent, but not so his Hebrew. If we combine the renderings in his Bible of 1535 with those in the Bible of 1539 and April 1540, it will be found that what is not traceable to any of these three sources is small, both in amount and importance.

Coverdale avowedly translated from the 'Douche' (the German) and the Latin, and in the Old Testament his 'five interpreters' were most probably Tyndale (for the Pentateuch and Jonah), the Vulgate, Pagninus's Latin Version, Luther, and the Zürich Bible (the work of Zwingli, Leo Judæ, Pellicanus, and others).

Interpolations from the familiar Latin Vulgate were marked by difference of type or by brackets according to Coverdale's express purpose. Many of the peculiar renderings, and in particular the interpolations or additions contained in the Prayer Book Version, are derived from the LXX through

the Gallican Psalter. The following additions, so marked by Coverdale in the Great Bible, are from the LXX and Vulgate:

Ps 1⁵ 'from the face of the earth'—*a facie terrae.*

4⁸ 'and oil'—*et olei.*

29¹ 'bring young rams unto the Lord'—*afferte Domino filios arietum.*

37²⁹ 'The unrighteous shall be punished'—*injusti punientur.*

Westcott has collected some sixty-six phrases which appear in the Prayer Book Version, and are taken from the Vulgate, and are not in the Hebrew.¹

The Latin titles of the Psalms are, of course, the first words of the Vulgate Version, *i.e.* the Gallican Psalter. The Prayer Book Psalter is practically a survival of our first English Bible, and still preserves traces of the influence of the Vulgate, *i.e.* of the Gallican Psalter and so indirectly of the LXX. To some extent the English Psalter remains the only witness in the English Church of the Primitive Church's Septuagintal freedom and of the various readings in the pre-Massoretic Hebrew text. This is not to say that the Prayer Book Psalter is substantially a reproduction of the Gallican Psalter and the LXX, for though Coverdale probably knew the Vulgate so well that its renderings would be clearly in his mind, yet in many places he deliberately gives a rendering different from that suggested by the Vulgate. He had great confidence in his German authorities, *e.g.* Sebastian Münster's Latin Version (1534-1535), which exerted considerable influence on English translators. It was a Bible with the Hebrew text and a Latin translation, side by side, the Latin being a version from the Hebrew. Westcott went so far as to say that Coverdale 'revised the text of Matthew (Matthew's Bible) by the help of Münster. The result was the Great Bible.' This statement is too sweeping and unqualified, but it calls our attention to the marked influence of Münster's work upon Coverdale—work done not on the Latin text of the Gallican Psalter, but on the Hebrew.

It was the Gallican Psalter which St. Augustine used exclusively in his *Enarrationes in Psalmos* (A.D. 415 and after), but in Africa the older texts, to the last, disputed the supremacy with Jerome's second revision. The Gospels and the Psalter were

the only portions of Jerome's translations received by the African Church. To the end of his days St. Augustine often used the Old Latin Version of the Old Testament. From A.D. 400 and onward, however, the Gospels from Jerome's version were read by the Church at Hippo. St. Augustine clung to the LXX and the Old Latin Version. The LXX was the Old Testament authorized by the Church and for it an inspiration, not inferior to that of the original, was claimed. Jerome himself was long in reaching a resolve to adopt the Hebrew text as a basis for his new Latin Version—*Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos*. It was not until 391 that he began to translate from the Hebrew. From 383 to 391 he translated nothing from the Hebrew, and St. Augustine thought his new policy a very doubtful one. 'Spiritus enim qui in prophetis erat, quando illa dixerunt, idem ipse erat in LXX viris, quando illa interpretati sunt' (Aug., *De Civ.*, xviii. 43).

When Jerome turned from the LXX to the Hebrew he was freely charged with presumption, unlawful innovation, and even sacrilege in daring to put it aside.

About 391 Jerome abandoned the Greek text of the Old Testament in favour of the 'Hebraica veritas' as the 'textus authenticus.' St. Augustine begged him not to do this, but to adhere to the LXX and so avoid unsettling the laity by lowering the authority of the LXX. One of Jerome's first works was his 'Hebrew' Psalter—*Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*—which appeared about 392-393. Jerome was much impressed by the great variations in the texts of the Greek Old Testament as contrasted with the uniformity of the Hebrew text. He claims that his plan is similar to that of Origen, and even more rational. While Origen confronted the various Greek editions with one another and indicates the relation in which the LXX stood to the current Hebrew text, Jerome went straight to the fountain-head itself, the Hebrew text, rigidly adhering to its terms. It may be Origen did not possess the requisite knowledge of Hebrew for Jerome's plan, and it is certain he would have regarded such a task as sacrilegious and also as playing into the hands of Jewish adversaries.

Henceforth for Jerome the unadulterated text of the Old Testament was to be found in the Hebrew Bible. The Hebrew text before Jerome was the unprinted Hebrew text, but this unpunctuated text was, it is agreed, substantially the same as the Massoretic Text of a later time.

Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter is of great historical

¹ There are many other interpolations from the Vulgate, which are not so marked by Coverdale. Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter was available in his time, and he may have used it.

interest and a most creditable piece of scholarship. It is exceedingly valuable for the study of the Psalter. Jerome was a good Hebrew scholar, using the best texts available in Palestine.

During Talmudic times (A.D. 200–500) the Rabbinical school at Tiberias had been famous. Jerome was familiar with Origen's Hexapla, and with the text of ancient versions in MSS. earlier than those now existing. His *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos* gives evidence as to the Hebrew text of the fourth century A.D., i.e. several hundred years before the oldest Hebrew MS. known to us. Where this Psalter differs from our Hebrew text and the LXX its evidence is of value and great interest as giving the opinion of the best Biblical scholar of ancient times as to the original text.

Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter never came into general use, for it never succeeded in displacing Jerome's revision of the Old Latin, and seems never to have been used in public worship; probably for much the same reason that the Authorized Version of the Psalms has never supplanted the Prayer Book Version in English Churches.¹ 'The text of the Gallican Psalter was so deeply rooted in popular use and affection, that the new version was powerless to supersede it' (Bardenhewer, *Patrology*, pp. 459 ff.). For the Mediæval Latin student the 'Hebrew' Psalter preserved a fair knowledge of the early Hebrew tradition of the literal rendering of the Psalms.

This Psalter is found in some of the best and earliest MSS. of the Latin Bible, such as the Codices *Amiatinus* (a leading MS. written in Northumbria before A.D. 715); *Cavensis* (a ninth-century MS. written in Spain, where this Psalter was specially popular); *Toletanus* (an eighth-century MS. in Paris); *Hubertianus* (a late ninth-century MS. in the British Museum).

The true text of the *Amiatinus* Psalter is not known throughout with certainty. In the *Cavensis* Codex this Psalter is not found in its usual context, but occurs (incomplete) at the end of the Apocalypse. In the *Toletanus* Codex the titles of the Psalms are missing in Ps 1–11. The *Hubertianus* text contains many Gallican readings and others from an unknown source. Later MSS. have the three Psalters or two of them in parallel columns. Some contain the 'Hebrew' Psalter only.²

¹ Jerome himself did not use it for liturgical purposes in his own monastery, for he tells us (A.D. 395–6) that he regularly explained the Lessons and Psalms for the day according to the LXX text.

² In the library at Monte Cassino is a Codex (twelfth

P. de Lagarde's edition of this Psalter is now very difficult to obtain, but there is a very useful modern edition by Dr. J. M. Harden—*Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* (S.P.C.K.; 1922) with introduction and critical notes on the text.

The Abbé Pérennès' judgment on this Psalter is, 'Cette version faite directement sur l'*hebraica veritas* n'a pas été introduite dans la Vulgate pour les raisons de prudence ecclésiastique. Elle rest très autorisée, et est éminemment utile pour la critique du texte' (*Les Psaumes*, 1922). The late W. Robertson Smith said it was the best of all the old versions of the Psalms. In many places, reckoned at 200, it is better than the Vulgate rendering, i.e. the rendering of the Gallican Psalter.

The following specimens will assist in forming an idea of the relation between the Hebrew, the LXX, the Vulgate (Gallican Psalter), and the 'Hebrew' Psalter.

Hebrew.—*Sēlāh*. LXX διάψαλμα (*interlude*).
Vulgate omits it entirely.

'Hebrew' Psalter—*semper*, in accordance with ancient Palestine tradition—Aquila, Quinta, and Sexta Greek Versions which have αεί, εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας, διαπαντός.

Readings in accordance with the Quinta are by no means infrequent in this Psalter.

Ps 9^{18b}.

Hebrew.—'The expectation (of the poor).'

LXX.—ἡ ὑπομονή.

Vulgate—*Patientia*.

'Hebrew' Psalter—*Expectatio*.

Ps 68^{11, 12}

Hebrew.—'The Lord giveth the word:

The women publishing the tidings are a great host.

Kings of hosts do flee, do flee:

And she that tarrieth at home divides the spoil.'

LXX.—ὁ θεὸς κύριος δώσει ῥῆμα τοῖς εὐαγγελιζομένοις δυνάμει πολλῇ,
ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν δυνάμεων τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ, καὶ ὡραιότητι τοῦ οἴκου διελέσθαι σκῦλα.

Vulgate.—*Dominus dabit verbum euangelizantibus uirtute multa.*

Rex uirtutem dilecti dilecti, et speciei domus diuidere spolia.

century) of a fourfold Psalter—Jerome's 'Hebrew' Psalter, the Gallican, the Roman, and an eclectic text obtained by emending a fourth-century Psalter by readings from Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

Jerome's faithfulness to the LXX leads him into obscure and almost impossible renderings.

'Hebrew' Psalter.—*Domine, dabis sermonem adnuntiatrix fortitudinis plurimae.*

Reges exercituum foederabuntur; foederabunter, et pulchritudo domus diuidet spolia.

Ps 105^{18b}.

Hebrew.—'his soul (i.e. he) entered into iron.'

LXX.—σίδηρον διήλθεν ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ.

Vulgate.—*ferrum pertransiit animam eius.*

'Hebrew' Psalter.—*in ferrum uenit anima eius.*

The Prayer Book Version, following the Vulgate (Gallican Psalter), has—'the iron entered into his soul.'

In *Psalm 14*, in the Prayer Book Version, vv.⁵⁻⁷, quoted in *Romans 3*¹³⁻¹⁸, do not appear in the A.V. and R.V., and are not in the Hebrew text. They are found in the older unrevised text of the κοινή, and thence passed into the Old Latin Psalter, and then into the Roman and Gallican Psalters and into Coverdale's Version, and so into the Prayer Book Version.

In translating from the Hebrew, Jerome maintained a middle course between an extreme literality on the one hand and an extreme freedom on the other. *Non uerbum e uerbo, sed sensum exprimere de sensu* was his general practice in the Psalter and in the Old Testament generally. Possibly he was less literal than he thought he was, for though a good Hebrew scholar he was not by any means faultless.

Unconsciously, probably, his style was modelled on that of the Old Latin, and this, together with an anxiety to reproduce the Hebrew, made his Latin, though forcible and stately, somewhat artificial and archaic. For the most part he took great pains, though he was a very rapid worker, but not always. The *Chronicles* he went over, word for word, with his Hebrew teacher, but *Tobit* was translated in a single day.

Jerome's knowledge of Hebrew, though good, was not quite equal to his knowledge of Greek, and when the Massoretic text is faulty he gives no better reading. When he departs from the text of Aquila (a slave to the letter of the Hebrew) and Symmachus (an idiomatic and polished writer, often interpretative), he is not very successful.

Occasionally Jerome shows traces of the influence of Rabbinical tradition, and he is fond of *interpreting*

Hebrew proper names, thereby reversing the practice of the LXX translators who frequently transliterate a hard Hebrew word.

The 'Hebrew' Psalter was, in a sense, a revision of the old one, for many expressions and phrases, even whole verses, were taken over unchanged. Jerome, however, was always ready to change, even in passages most familiar. *Domine, saluum fac regem: et exaudi nos in die qua inuocauerimus te* of the Vulgate becomes *Domine, salua, rex exaudiet nos in die qua inuocauerimus* in the 'Hebrew' Psalter (*Ps 20*¹⁰).

Jerome's translations were very frequently undertaken at the wish or request of his friends and others. At the request of Pope Damasus he began his revision of the Old Latin. At the instigation of Paula and Eustochium he revised the *Psalterium Romanum*. Chromatius, bishop of Aquileia, and Heliodorus, bishop of Altinum, near Aquileia, by their keen interest and by the liberality with which they contributed to the expenses of the work and the salaries of the amanuenses, urged and encouraged Jerome to go forward with his translating from Hebrew into Latin, and their names, with others, mentioned in his prefaces to various Old Testament books, are for ever associated with the great work of the Vulgate.

Jerome's work upon the Bible, more especially his Latin Vulgate, represents an enterprise which, for vastness and consequences, it would be hard to parallel, and impossible, perhaps, to surpass in literary achievement. It was for nearly a thousand years the Bible for Western Christians, and was directly or indirectly the parent of vernacular versions in Western Europe. It exercised a powerful influence on our English Versions. Transliterated words alone form a large class. It is, moreover, the source of a great deal of current theological terminology, and is still a witness to the text and to a very ancient interpretation of the Hebrew and Greek. Much, however, of the value of the Vulgate for criticism has been lost through the corruptions which have been allowed to affect the text.

Jerome was moved 'to undertake the translating of the Old Testament out of the fountains themselves; which he performed with that evidence of great learning, judgment, industry, and faithfulness, that he hath for ever bound the Church unto him in a debt of special remembrance and thankfulness' (*The Translators to the Reader*, in Preface to the Authorized Version of the Bible).

Recent Foreign Theology.

Varia.

FIVE years ago attention was called in these columns to the second edition of Meinhold's *Introduction to the Old Testament*. So popular and valuable has it proved to be that a third edition has just appeared,¹ which is twenty-two pages longer than the second, and takes into account all the relevant literature of the intervening years, such as Menes on the Pre-exilic Laws of Israel, Jepson on the Book of the Covenant, Torrey's Pseudo-Ezekiel, Junker's examination of the Daniel problem, the recent discussions of the Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah by Mowinckel and others in the pages of the *Z.A.W.*, and scores of other books and articles. There is an interesting sketch of the new view that, while in the first three Songs the Servant is Deutero-Isaiah himself, 52¹³-53¹² was written by *Trito-Isaiah* in explanation of the Servant's unexpected fate. This view Meinhold was bound to reject, as on other grounds he advocates the collective interpretation of the Servant. It may be enough to remind readers unfamiliar with the first or second editions that this is no ordinary Introduction, confined to literary problems, analysis of documents, etc.; it introduces its readers not only to the literature, but to the great fields of history and theology or religion which are implicated in the literature, so that the story of the people with the development of their religious thought from the earliest times to the period of the Maccabees, here sketched by the hand of a master, can be followed with ease and pleasure.

The veteran Budde's latest publication is on *The Story of Paradise*,² on which he has been writing at intervals for almost fifty years. In it he vigorously defends the thesis that in the original story there was only one tree, and that the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. The two verses dealing with the tree of life (3^{22, 24}) represent another tradition, and the earlier references to this tree are interpolations. He also detects other additions inconsistent with the original story, for example, the reference to man as tilling the ground (2^{5b}), or dressing and keeping the garden (2^{15b}). Man does

not work and does not need to work in Paradise; he lives on the fruit of its wonderful trees. Paradise is emphatically not a garden of the gods or of God, it is specially made by God for man; the tree of life, on the other hand, is in the garden of the gods, and it must, therefore, be made inaccessible if man is not to attain the divine prerogative of immortality. Budde deals severely with a recent discussion of Hans Schmidt on Paradise and the Fall, which seeks to prove that in the Genesis story there are three narratives, all of which centre in the sexual problem. The discussion abounds in fine psychological observations, and though Budde finds no 'protevangelium' in the story, he has the highest admiration for the skill of the writer and his insight into human nature. Here are a few other points: he puts 6³ after 3¹⁹, he translates 3¹³ 'Why hast thou done this?' and he follows Holzinger in reading חֶבְרָנָה instead of חֶבְרָנָה in 3¹⁷ ('in pain shalt thou till it'—not eat of it). The discussion is accompanied by an idiomatic translation.

Gottfried Kuhn has followed up his recent book on Ecclesiastes by one on Proverbs.³ A brief introduction offers a fruitful comparison between the Law as emphasized by Deuteronomy, and Wisdom as emphasized by Proverbs, in which it is shown that the distinction of Proverbs lies in its intimate knowledge of human life. The bulk of the book is occupied with criticism of the text which, whether ultimately accepted or not, is always worthy of consideration. Here are a few specimens: 4^{7b} קָנָה וְכָנָה ('with all thy zeal be zealous for understanding'—to avoid the repetition of קָנָה in v. 7^a). 10⁴ רָאשׁ עֵשֶׂה לְרָאשׁ עֵשֶׂה ('the slack hand is punished with poverty'). 10¹¹ בּוֹס הַמֶּיץ ('the mouth of the wicked is a cup of vinegar'). 13¹⁶ יַעֲשֶׂה לְיִשְׁחָה ('every prudent man is wisely silent'—not worketh with knowledge). 15²⁰ יִשְׁמַע לְיִשְׁמָה ('a wise son obeys his father'). The provokingly difficult 30³¹ he emends thus, חֹר וְרִים אִמְתָּנִי שֹׁמֵר וּמִלֵּךְ אֵל יָקִים עִמּוֹ ('the boar and the wild ox which are dreadful when they rear, and a king with whom is the avenging God'). Kuhn makes the interesting remark that, if this conjecture be accepted, we have here the only com-

³ Beiträge zur Erklärung des Salomonischen Spruchbuches (W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart).

¹ Johannes Meinhold, *Einführung in das Alte Testament* (Töpelmann, Giessen; geh. Rm. 8; geb. Rm. 9.75).

² Karl Budde, *Die biblische Paradiesesgeschichte* (Töpelmann, Giessen; Rm. 4.80).

plimentary reference to the swine in the Bible—which again may account for the mutilation of the original text. There are also notes on the Greek, Vulgate, and Syriac versions of Proverbs and on the Targum. We are glad to note that in his critical conjectures Kuhn has taken into account not only the work of Oesterley, but also of Melville

Scott, whose *Textual Discoveries in Proverbs*, etc., is too little known. In the section 22¹⁷–24²² he also reckons with the Egyptian original of Amenem-ope. No one dealing with Proverbs can afford to ignore Kuhn's stimulating study of the text.

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

Trinity College, Glasgow.

Contributions and Comments.

'Immanuel' and 'The Suffering Servant of Jahweh':

A SUGGESTION.

Is it possible that '*Immanuel*,' soon to be born of 'the young woman of marriageable age,' was a *personification of the righteous 'remnant'*, so central in Isaiah's teaching—the faithful few who proved their trust in God's presence by their obedience to His will, therefore the ideal possessors of the Promised land 'flowing with milk and honey'? (Is 7¹⁰⁻¹⁷ 8⁸; cf. 1¹⁹ and 57^{13c}).

(1) A clue to this interpretation lies in the command to Isaiah (7³) to take with him '*Shear-jashub*'—his living prophecy that '*a remnant shall return [to Jahweh]*'—for that interview with Ahaz which led up to the prediction of '*Immanuel*'; that is, the living child, '*Shearjashub*,' is the Divine assurance of such a '*remnant*'; the vision-child, '*Immanuel*,' is a *prophetic personification of the 'remnant' community* enjoying God's protection and favour even in the midst of the devastated land (cf. vv. 21, 22 and context).

(2) If so, 'the young woman of marriageable age,' 'just come to maturity' (mistranslated 'virgin,' we are told), must represent *Judah* (or *Israel* as a whole), of whom the faithful '*remnant*,' '*Immanuel*,' is about to be born? The personification of *Judah* and of *Israel* as a *woman*—(a) virgin, (b) faithless wife—was familiar, from the vivid teaching of *Amos*, *Hosea*, and *Isaiah* himself; the word now used (as explained, e.g., in *H.D.B.* sing. vol., p. 959b, and in *Peake's Com.* (p. 442a)) appears singularly appropriate for the purpose of this prophecy, so understood—when the nation is in any degree, or in point of time or circumstance, ripe for God's will?

(3) 'Butter and honey' ('or, "thick milk and honey"') 'shall he eat, when he knoweth to refuse the evil and choose the good,' is surely just another way of saying, 'If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land!'—though about to suffer overwhelming invasion, ideally and ultimately '*thy land, O Immanuel!*' (In Doughty's *Wanderings in Arabia*, the months when milk is abundant are hailed with great relief and thankfulness as the time of plenty.)

(4) Does it not seem almost inevitable that the prophet, whose writings are so crowded with picturesque symbols, should dramatically personify not only the unworthy *nation* but, above all, the righteous '*remnant*' of *Judah* or *Israel*;—the subject of his peculiarly characteristic doctrine;—the nucleus of faithful souls in whom he centred his passionate hope for the future? (8¹⁶⁻¹⁸). It is on their account he is confident that God will eventually raise up a truly consecrated, glorious King, worthy of a truly consecrated people! (9²⁻⁷ 11¹⁻¹⁰).

(5) Then, it will be *this personification of 'the remnant'* that *Micah* takes up (5³) in his 'direct reference' to the '*Immanuel*' prophecy (*H.D.B.* ii. p. 486); he, too, associates with it a vision of the ideal King (5²⁻³), beautiful and gracious as *Isaiah's* vision of the King is majestic and exultant. (Is there another allusion in Is 66⁷⁻⁹?) Nearly all the prophets after *Isaiah* appear fascinated by his thought of the '*remnant*' (which must therefore have been most impressively presented), and it is appealed to by *St. Paul* in *Ro* 9, especially vv. 6-8, 27, 29.

It may be added that, so interpreted, '*Immanuel*' becomes all the more remarkably a prophecy of the Christ (perhaps *Paul* would say, of Christ and His redeemed Church), since He alone perfectly mani-

tested God's presence and fulfilled His purpose for Israel.

Is the idea of a *personification of the faithful in Israel* adopted, also, by Deutero-Isaiah (or another), under the new, great figure of '*The Suffering Servant of Jahweh*' (or, more comprehensively, '*The Faithful Servant of Jahweh*'), evidently distinct from (a) His Servant Israel, the nation itself ('blind and deaf!'); (b) His Servant Cyrus, summoned for a specific purpose; and (c) His Servant the prophet? Can he be, as it were, '*Immanuel*,' unnamed, coming to his full stature, coming to his own through suffering; more and more identifying with himself the nation to be redeemed for his sake?

The unifying theme of this noble collection (40-66) appears to be: Jahweh is God alone, other gods' nothing; as proved irrefutably by His care for His Witness, His chosen Servant Israel, culminating in her restoration (foretold!) after discipline, accomplished *politically* by means of His chosen Servant Cyrus, and *spiritually* by means of

His chosen Servant the (personified) 'faithful Israel.'

The following are passages which suggest personification of 'the faithful' in Israel (R.V. noticing marg. readings):

Is 7¹⁴⁻¹⁶ 8^{7, 8}, Mic 5³.

Is 42¹⁻⁴ or 7; or 1⁻⁹, with doxology 10-13?

Is 49¹⁻⁶ or 9; or 1⁻¹², with doxology 13.

Is 52¹²⁻⁵³ 12; with doxology 54¹⁻¹⁰.

Is 61¹⁻⁴ 7^b-62^{1, 6} (*i.e.* omitting sections in the second person).

Is 66⁵⁻⁹ (with doxology 10-13?).

Also—fragments?—

Is 48¹⁶ 50⁴⁻⁷ or 10.

Is 51¹⁶ 59^{20, 21}.

All this is very venturesome! but reverent, I trust, and I should be most grateful for any competent opinion regarding it.

ANNIE E. SKEMP.

Colwyn Bay.

Entre Nous.

Toyohiko Kagawa.

There has been little definite information available here about the Kingdom of God Movement, so we were fortunate last month in getting an authoritative account by one so closely identified with it as Dr. Axling. The article left one eager to know more of the life and doings of the man whose vision and work made this great movement possible. Most opportunely there comes from Dr. Axling this month a 'plain and unvarnished recital of Kagawa's two score and four years of life.' The volume, entitled *Kagawa*, is published by the S.C.M. (6s. net). It is a piece of excellent and unbiased portraiture, a quite admirable study of the man and his background.

'Kagawa is an ascetic in his personal habits, but neither his face . . . nor his genial bearing and ringing laughter, betray it. For him life is no futile, forlorn gesture. It teems with interest.' In appearance he is sturdy, his face serene and kindly.

He had an unhappy childhood. Born in Kobe, in July 1888, he was the illegitimate child of a dancing girl and a man of wealth and position. Both parents died when he was four, and he was then taken to the home of his father's legal wife, who treated the child with extraordinary cruelty.

Nature was his only solace. His education, however, was not neglected, and he learned early the fundamentals of the Buddhist faith. He went afterwards to live with a rich uncle, attended the Boys' Middle School at Tokushima and there came into contact with Christianity; accepted it; and was summarily turned out from his home and permanently disinherited.

The chief influence of this period was Dr. H. W. Myers. He told him of a 'God who cares. He took him out under the open sky, turned his sad, tear-stained face toward the sun, and said, "Look at the sky, look at the sun, let your tears evaporate and then we will laugh." "Consider the lilies of the field." He read and re-read the passage. He memorized the whole chapter. He knelt. The pent-up yearning of his heart burst into a poignant cry, "O God, make me like Christ!" a prayer and a dedication to an overmastering life-purpose. The dawn broke. His spirit was flooded with light and life. His melancholy melted away like the mist before the rising sun. Kagawa was born again. Life immediately took on a new meaning. He felt that he had been given a divine mandate to serve the poor.'

At the Presbyterian College in Tokyo his love of Christ grew and with it his passion to befriend the poor. He 'shared his room with a beggar picked up by the wayside. The students were not slow in showing their resentment. They shunned him and his ragged room-mate. Kagawa, however, shared his food and his bed with him, and treated him like a brother long lost.' After a time, at Kobe Theological Seminary, Kagawa took 'a straight header into the depths of the Shinkawa slums.' He was now twenty-one years of age. In these slums ten thousand people were sardined into houses six feet square, more like prison cells than houses. For years he lived there, among ruffians who thought nothing of murder, beggars who demanded even his clothes and got them, and among the diseased, and to this cell he brought his wife—a woman, Dr. Axling says, 'of heroic mould.'

'At one time over ten down-and-outs were under his hospitable six-by-six roof. It became inadequate, and they removed some of the walls in order to make room for all to lie down. Among them was one in the last stages of tuberculosis, whose soiled, germ-infected garments Kagawa washed with his own hands. One was mentally deranged and, though well educated, was deserted by both family and friends. Another was a sick prostitute rotten with syphilis. It was through sharing his bed with a beggar that Kagawa contracted trachoma, the dread eye disease which has almost robbed him of his sight.'

In surroundings like these he wrote fifty books which have had huge circulations. The bulk were religious, but they include novels, books of poems, and treatises on various economic subjects. They have brought him in over £20,000 in royalties. 'Money in a measure,' he says, 'has been mine. When I saw, however, that most men were penniless, its possession filled me with a sense of shame and I scattered it abroad. Thus, like the rest, I am closely pressed by the pursuing wolf of straitened circumstances.'

There is no space even to touch on Kagawa the able administrator and the organizer of the Labour Party of Japan. For this and many other points the book must be read. Kagawa has done great things, but 'it is a long, long way from the present chaos to

the new social order as this seer sees it, but he leaps along the level stretches and eagerly climbs the steep ascents, borne on by a mystical call to do big things in hastening its coming.'

God's Gambler.

'The gambler chief in the Shinkawa slums, whom I well knew, hazarded his all. I do the same for a good cause. Whether it will mean nakedness or whether I win can only be known by a throw of the dice. "I have staked my all; property, position, fame, everything has been staked for God. Heads or tails, which will it be? That's as God wills. It is this gambler's course which I pursue that keeps my purse so poor. The prophet Jeremiah called himself God's tippler. I will call myself God's gambler. For Him I have wagered my last mite."''¹

Ownership.

'Ownership is like a shell. The only one who profits by it is he who shuts himself up within it. To him who desires to reach upward and grow, it is only a hindrance. As the shell exists only for the spineless animals, so those who cling to the right of ownership may be called mollusca.

'In an age of invention and discovery it is but natural that there should be a great upheaval in the thinking regarding this question of ownership so strenuously advocated by the spineless species. The mollusca have my sympathy.'²

A Scientific Mystic.

'The more scientific I am the more I feel that I am penetrating deeply into God's world. Especially in the domain of biology do I feel as though I am talking with God face to face. The world which is not cut off from life does not need Kant's agnosticism. Through life I discover a purpose even in a mechanical world. Science is the mystery of mysteries. It is the divine revelation of revelations.'³

¹ William Axling, *Kagawa*, 169.

² *Ibid.*, 97.

³ *Ibid.*, 152.